



## Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive DSpace Repository

---

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

---

2014-06

### Stakeholder analysis of integrating women into ground combat units

Drennan, Charles R.

Monterey, California: Naval Postgraduate School

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/42613>

---

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

*Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun*



<http://www.nps.edu/library>

Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community.

Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School  
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle  
Monterey, California USA 93943**



**NAVAL  
POSTGRADUATE  
SCHOOL**

**MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA**

**THESIS**

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS OF INTEGRATING  
WOMEN INTO GROUND COMBAT UNITS**

by

Charles R. Drennan

June 2014

Thesis Co-Advisors:

Kathryn Aten  
Mark Eitelberg  
Michael Smith

**Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited**

*Reissued 18 Aug. 2014 to correct degree on title page.*

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**
*Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.

<b>1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)</b>	<b>2. REPORT DATE</b> June 2014	<b>3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED</b> Master's Thesis
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS OF INTEGRATING WOMEN INTO GROUND COMBAT UNITS		<b>5. FUNDING NUMBERS</b>
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Charles R. Drennan		
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>
<b>9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> N/A		<b>10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>
<b>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b> The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. IRB protocol number ____N/A____.		
<b>12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited		<b>12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE</b> A
<b>13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words)</b>		
<p>Barriers to women's service in the U.S. military have been greatly reduced over the past two decades. Policies preventing women from serving on ships, submarines, and in attack aircraft were removed in 1994. More recently, in January 2013, the Department of Defense overturned the 1994 Exclusion Policy on women serving in direct ground combat units. Implementing this change presents a significant challenge. The decision to do so has reignited a long-standing debate over women's rights and equal opportunity within the military. The issue is now receiving an abundance of both negative and positive publicity, suggesting increased scrutiny over decisions made by civilian and military leaders. This thesis provides recommendations to support integrating women into ground combat arms positions. This is accomplished by identifying the impediments and drivers to gaining acceptance of the new policy and by distilling recommendations through a framing analysis of the debate in electronic media. The analysis identifies key stakeholder groups and issue frames, providing a lens through which to gain a better understanding of stakeholder perspectives and their arguments for and against further integration. Recommendations for future research are offered in the concluding sections of the thesis.</p>		

<b>14. SUBJECT TERMS</b> Women in combat; integrating women into combat units; women and direct ground combat units; combat ban on women lifted; rescinding the 1994 Exclusion Policy on Women in Combat		<b>15. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 131
		<b>16. PRICE CODE</b>
<b>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified	<b>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified
		<b>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b> UU

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

 Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)  
 Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited**

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS OF INTEGRATING WOMEN INTO GROUND  
COMBAT UNITS**

Charles R. Drennan  
Captain, United States Marine Corps  
B.S., North Carolina State University, 2003

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL**  
**June 2014**

Author: Charles R. Drennan

Approved by: Kathryn Aten  
Thesis Co-Advisor

Mark Eitelberg  
Thesis Co-Advisor

Michael Smith  
Thesis Co-advisor

William Gates  
Dean, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## ABSTRACT

Barriers to women's service in the U.S. military have been greatly reduced over the past two decades. Policies preventing women from serving on ships, submarines, and in attack aircraft were removed in 1994. More recently, in January 2013, the Department of Defense overturned the 1994 Exclusion Policy on women serving in direct ground combat units. Implementing this change presents a significant challenge. The decision to do so has reignited a long-standing debate over women's rights and equal opportunity within the military. The issue is now receiving an abundance of both negative and positive publicity, suggesting increased scrutiny over decisions made by civilian and military leaders.

This thesis provides recommendations to support integrating women into ground combat arms positions. This is accomplished by identifying the impediments and drivers to gaining acceptance of the new policy and by distilling recommendations through a framing analysis of the debate in electronic media. The analysis identifies key stakeholder groups and issue frames, providing a lens through which to gain a better understanding of stakeholder perspectives and their arguments for and against further integration. Recommendations for future research are offered in the concluding sections of the thesis.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	A. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM .....	1
	B. PURPOSE.....	2
	1. Objectives.....	2
	2. Research Questions.....	3
	C. SCOPE AND ORGANIZATION .....	3
II.	BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
	A. INTRODUCTION.....	5
	B. BACKGROUND .....	5
	1. Overview of Women in Combat: Examples from the Distant Past .....	6
	2. History and Policy Review of Women Service in U.S Military.....	8
	a. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.....	9
	b. The World Wars .....	10
	c. Post-World War II through the 1970s.....	11
	d. 1980s and 1990s .....	12
	C. FOREIGN (ALLIED) COUNTRIES' POLICIES ON WOMEN IN COMBAT.....	13
	1. Composition of Women in Foreign Services .....	14
	a. Australian Military.....	15
	b. Canadian Military .....	15
	c. British Military .....	16
	d. Israeli Military.....	16
	e. Composition Summary.....	17
	2. Law and Policies of Foreign Militaries .....	18
	a. Canada.....	18
	b. Australia .....	19
	c. United Kingdom .....	20
	d. Israel.....	21
	e. Summary of Law and Policy.....	21
	3. Studies, Reviews and Physical Standards.....	22
	a. Australia .....	22
	b. United Kingdom .....	24
	c. Canada.....	26
	d. Summary of Allied Policies on Women in Combat .....	27
	D. SUMMARY .....	27
III.	METHODOLOGY .....	29
	A. INTRODUCTION.....	29
	B. FRAMING .....	29
	C. DATA AND SAMPLING.....	33
	D. ANALYSIS APPROACH.....	34

<b>IV.</b>	<b>ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	37
B.	STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFIED IN DATA SET .....	37
1.	Proponent Stakeholders .....	37
a.	<i>Service Women’s Action Network</i> .....	37
b.	<i>Defense Advisory Committee for Women in the Services</i> .....	40
c.	<i>American Civil Liberties Union Women’s Rights Project</i> .....	41
d.	<i>President of the United States</i> .....	42
e.	<i>Joint Chiefs of Staff and Chairman JCS</i> .....	43
f.	<i>Secretary of Defense</i> .....	44
2.	Opponent Stakeholders .....	46
a.	<i>Center for Military Readiness</i> .....	46
b.	<i>Female Service Members and Veterans</i> .....	47
c.	<i>Retired Military Officers Most Noted in Data Set</i> .....	50
C.	ANALYSIS OF FRAMES .....	57
1.	Proponent Frame Analysis.....	57
2.	Opponent Frame Analysis.....	61
D.	SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS .....	66
<b>V.</b>	<b>FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>69</b>
A.	FINDINGS .....	69
1.	Proponents’ Fairness Framing .....	69
2.	Opponents’ Effectiveness Framing .....	73
B.	IMPLICATIONS TO DOD.....	79
C.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DOD .....	81
D.	SUMMARY .....	83
<b>VI.</b>	<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>85</b>
A.	SUMMARY .....	85
B.	CONCLUSIONS .....	87
C.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH .....	89
APPENDIX A.	TIME SUMMARY OF WOMEN IN U.S. MILITARY .....	91
APPENDIX B.	LIST OF DATA POINTS COLLECTED IN DATA SET .....	97
<b>LIST OF REFERENCES .....</b>		<b>107</b>
<b>INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST .....</b>		<b>113</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Example Signature Matrix (from Creed et al., 2005, p. 41) .....	31
Table 2.	Example Functionality Table (from Creed et al., 2005, p. 42) .....	32
Table 3.	Example of Master Data Source Sheet .....	35
Table 4.	Proponent-Stakeholders of Integrating Women into Direct Ground Combat Units .....	45
Table 5.	Opponent Stakeholders (Groups and Individuals) of Integrating Women into Direct Ground Combat Units.....	56
Table 6.	Proponents “Fairness” Frame .....	60
Table 7.	Opponent “Effectiveness” Frame .....	66
Table 8.	Primary Themes .....	68
Table 9.	Proponent and Opponent Frames, Assumptions and Values .....	79

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACL	anterior cruciate ligament
ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union
ACS	all-corps soldier
ADF	Australian Defense Force
AFT	annual fitness test (British military)
BFA	basic fitness assessment
CA	combat arms
CAPT	captain (USMC rank abbreviation)
CBA	cost-benefit analysis
CF	Canadian Forces
CFA	combat fitness assessment
CMR	Center for Military Readiness
CNA	Center for Naval Analyses
CNO	Chief of Naval Operations
CJCS	Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff
COIN	counter-insurgency
CREW	combat related employment of women
CRS	Congressional Research Service
DACOWITS	Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services
DADT	Don't Ask / Don't Tell
DOD	Department of Defense
DOPMA	Defense Officer Manpower Personnel Management Act
FET	female engagement team
FOB	forward operating base
FRC	Family Research Council
FY	fiscal year
HASC	House Armed Services Committee
IDF	Israeli Defense Force
IED	improvised explosive device
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff

LTG	lieutenant general (Army rank abbreviation)
LTC	lieutenant colonel (Army rank abbreviation)
MEF	Marine Expeditionary Force
MG	major general (Army rank abbreviation)
MOC	military occupational career
MOS	military occupational specialty
MP	military police
NBC	nuclear, biological and chemical
NMC	non-commissioned member
NSC	National Security Council
PB	patrol base
PES	physical employment standards
PFA	personal fitness test (British military)
PFA	pre-enlistment physical fitness assessment (Australian military)
PFT	physical fitness test
P.L.	public law
POP REP	population representation
POTUS	President of the United States
PRMC	Potential Royal Marine Course
RAAF	Royal Australian Air Force
RAN	Royal Australian Navy
RCT	Regimental Combat Team
RDJ	run-dodge-jump
ROTC	Reserve Officer Training Corps
SecDef	Secretary of Defense
SRI	socially responsible investing
SWAN	Service Women's Action Network
SWAT	special weapons and tactics
U.K.	United Kingdom
U.S.	United States
USS	United States ship
USMC	United States Marine Corps

WAAC	Women's Army Auxiliary Corps
WAC	Women's Army Corps
WAFS	Women's Auxiliary Flying Squadron
WASP	Women's Air Force Service Pilots
WAVES	Women in Voluntary Emergency Service
WND	<i>World Net Daily</i>
WREI	Women's Research & Education Institute

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has been one of the most arduous tasks I have ever completed in my professional military career. As my family and my advisory team know, I am a better helicopter pilot than I am a writer. This could not have been done without all of you.

To my beautiful wife, Laura, thank you for your love and support and for keeping me grounded over the past 18 months. To our daughter, Cheyenne, thank you for being such a great kid and a constant joy. To Paws, my four-legged friend, thank you for being a great listener and allowing me to vent when needed.

To my advisory team, I send special thanks to each of you. Professor Aten, thank you for the countless hours spent assisting me to develop this study and for your time in editing. You are an educator and mentor. Professor Eitelberg, thank you for assisting in getting this study started and, most of all, thank you for your patience and the efforts to revise, edit, and still educate down the home stretch. To Captain Smith, thank you for your assistance in this thesis. Our many conversations were enlightening.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM**

Barriers to women's service in the U.S. military have been greatly reduced over the past two decades. Policies that prevented women from serving on ships, submarines, and in attack aircraft were removed in 1994. More recently, in January 2013, the Defense Department overturned the 1994 Exclusion Policy on women serving in direct ground combat units. As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Dempsey, stated at the time: "By eliminating the direct combat exclusion provision . . . the burden used to be that we would say, why should a woman serve in a particular specialty? Now it's, why shouldn't a woman serve in a particular specialty?" ("DOD Memos," 2013, p. 5). However, implementing this change, integrating women into ground combat units, presents a significant challenge. The decision to do so has reignited a long-standing debate over women's role in the military and the potential outcomes of women's unrestricted participation in combat. The issue is now receiving an abundance of both negative and positive publicity. The prevalence and nature of the debate suggest that diverse stakeholders, including the American public, the American military, and America's allies, will scrutinize military leaders' decisions and actions.

As a result of the blurring of frontlines on the modern battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan, increased attention was focused on the role of service women in combat operations. In these theaters, women were exposed to more combat and participated in specialized roles, such as female engagement teams (FETs), where they served alongside the infantry and other direct ground combat units. Momentum accelerated with the repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT) policy, two lawsuits brought against the Defense Department for unlawful discrimination, and the 2012 decision to open up thousands of positions that brought women closer to the frontlines. Clearly, integrating women into ground combat units is controversial and will require support from diverse groups, including lawmakers, the military, service men and women, and the American public. To succeed, it is important that the implementation process maintains legitimacy and gains stakeholder acceptance.

## **B. PURPOSE**

This thesis strives to develop recommendations that will assist in gaining stakeholder acceptance of integrating women into ground combat arms positions. This is accomplished through a framing analysis of the debate in electronic media to identify potential impediments and drivers to gaining acceptance of integrating women into ground combat. The analysis identifies key stakeholder groups and issue frames, which provide a lens through which to achieve a better understanding of stakeholders' perspectives and arguments. A thorough understanding of the stakeholders and their perspectives can help to reveal potential impediments and drivers and suggest actions toward gaining stakeholder acceptance of the new policy. The thesis concludes with recommendations to further study the implications of integrating women into direct ground combat units.

### **1. Objectives**

This study reviews the history of women serving in combat, focusing on women's service in the U.S. military and the major policy changes and milestone events that created expanded opportunities. The study seeks to increase understanding of what is meant by direct ground combat, as written in policy, and how this meaning is interpreted by different social groups and used to support arguments for and against integrating women into direct ground combat units. The study also includes a detailed review of actions and "lessons learned" from the experiences of other countries, specifically Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Israel.

The goal of this thesis is to develop a better understanding of the viewpoints of the different stakeholders regarding the integration of women into combat units and to identify the issue frames they use to support their positions in the media. A deeper understanding of the issues and the arguments presented by stakeholder groups will suggest actions and communication to increase the legitimacy of military leaders' actions and decisions and encourage stakeholders' acceptance of the policy change.

## **2. Research Questions**

This study seeks to answer the following research question: what are the impediments and levers to gaining stakeholder acceptance for fully integrating women into ground combat arms? To address this question, the study explores the following secondary research questions:

- What is meant by “ground combat,” and has the current battlefield environment altered the definition?
- Who are the key social groups engaged in the debate?
- What are key issues and implications of removing exclusions on women serving in ground combat units, as discussed in the debate?
- How does each social group frame the issues?

## **C. SCOPE AND ORGANIZATION**

The scope of this thesis is to identify the key stakeholders and issue frames surrounding the debate in digital media, published online from January 1, 2012 to January 31, 2014, on integrating women into ground combat arms specialties. The thesis identifies impediments and levers to gaining acceptance by stakeholders and offers several recommendations. The study is limited to exploring the perceptions of key stakeholder groups, the issues they present, and how they are portrayed in online media and to recommendations that may assist in gaining the support of stakeholder groups. The study does not assess job requirements or capabilities, but rather examines stakeholder groups’ presentations of these issues. Furthermore, the study does not evaluate the decision to integrate women into ground combat arms positions.

This research assumes that, given current direction, integrating women into combat arms positions will occur; additionally, it is assumed that military personnel will work to best integrate women under guidance provided by the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense, whether or not they agree with the decision to rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy. This study thus focuses on how to facilitate integration by gaining stakeholder support so that integration can be accomplished with minimal adverse impact.

This thesis is organized into six chapters. Chapter I introduces the thesis. Chapter II presents a history of women's service in combat, including the following: an in-depth account of women's service in the U.S. military and the policies behind service opportunities; the definition of direct ground combat over time; and a detailed summary of selected U.S. allies' integration of women into ground combat units. Chapter III describes the study's methods, information sources, and data. Chapter IV presents the analysis identifying stakeholder groups and describing the issue frames they use. Chapter V discusses the findings and their implications for integrating women into ground combat units. Finally, Chapter VI presents a summary and conclusions, along with recommendations for further research. Two appendices are included: a chronology of women in the U.S. military; and a list of sources used to analyze stakeholders' arguments.

## **II. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **A. INTRODUCTION**

Formally integrating women into ground arms specialties, such as the infantry or any other combat-oriented unit, has been a subject of heated debate for many years in the United States. The debate has returned to the forefront in recent years due to increased attention from actions such as the repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” which allows gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military, the continuing removal of restrictions on the assignment of women to hazardous military jobs, and, in 2013, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta’s announcement to rescind the 1994 Exclusionary Policy on women serving in combat (“DOD Memos,” 2013). The active media presence in Iraq and Afghanistan has shown the world that all service members deployed to a war zone without clear frontlines serve in harm’s way. This increases the importance in understanding the definition of ground combat and how it has changed over time along with the roles that women fill.

Women have historically served in many capacities from supporting roles to the frontlines. Women’s roles in the U.S. military have expanded as policies changed, providing greater opportunities for occupational assignment. These changes were often a response to mounting pressure at home for equal rights, but also due to the real-time requirements of ground commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan. As battlefield commanders use women to fill specific roles in war, a gap has emerged between policy and practice, bringing even more attention to the issue of integrating women into ground combat units. Similarly, the issue has been debated among many allies of the United States, specifically Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and Israel. This review explores briefly the history of women in combat, the experiences of women in the American military, the practices and policies of allies, and definitions of combat in the context of history, practice, and recent battlefield demands.

### **B. BACKGROUND**

It is important to understand the history of women serving in the military, and particularly in combat, to fully recognize the many sacrifices and contributions women

have made throughout history in supporting their countries when needed most. This review draws heavily on information summarized by Kristen W. Culler in her 2000 master's thesis, *The Decision to Allow Military Women into Combat Positions: A Study in Policy and Politics*. The review also draws upon information summarized by Taunja M. Menke in her 2013 paper, *The Integration of Women into Combat Arms Units*, and Cindy Sheppard's 2007 research paper, *Women in Combat*.

After reviewing the history of women's service in combat in the United States and more generally, this discussion explores present conditions in Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and Israel. The review utilizes background information from a 2012 Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) study that describes the structure and composition, laws, and policies governing the role of women, specific physical standards or assessments used, and scientific or academic studies of issues related to women's service in ground combat roles in the militaries of the four selected countries (Matsel, Schulte, & Yopp, 2012).

## **1. Overview of Women in Combat: Examples from the Distant Past**

Women have served alongside men, both on the ground and in the air, in major wars from centuries past to the U.S. Civil War, World Wars I and II, and to present day. These women were warriors, mothers, and daughters, having fought throughout history to protect their land, families, and way of life. Many of these women have become icons of history, such as Joan of Arc and Florence Nightingale, while the contributions of Russian female soldiers in World War II and Israel's female soldiers in its War of Independence are perhaps not as well known. Women have proven themselves capable and equal to men throughout history, contributing in any way they can, fighting and dying alongside their countrymen.

One of the most famous and studied women warriors in history is Joan of Arc. In 1429, during the Hundred Years' War, Joan of Arc was empowered by French leaders to command troops in battle, where she successfully defeated the English (Culler, 2000). Joan of Arc is most known for defying the King of France by taking her own initiative in launching an operation against the English at Compiègne (Culler, 2000). It was during

this engagement that she was captured, sold to the English, and later burned at the stake in 1431. The Catholic Church has since professed her innocence and declared her a saint (Culler, 2000).

Florence Nightingale became well-known for her documented contributions and work in the Crimean War (Culler, 2000). As a volunteer, “she assumed the direction of all medical forces at the war front” (Culler, 2000). These efforts by her and her staff contributed directly to the British achieving victory. Their selfless actions to aid the wounded on the frontlines reflected British society’s willingness to risk the lives of women to receive the benefits of their presence at the war’s front (Culler, 2000). Many years later, Florence Nightingale became the first woman to be awarded the British Order of Merit (Culler, 2000).

Other particularly noteworthy examples of contributions were made by women serving in combat during World War II and Israel’s War of Independence. In World War II, for example, the Soviets employed two bomber regiments and one fighting regiment in which all aircrew and support positions were filled by women (Bateman as cited in Culler, 2000). Nadya Popova, a Russian bomber pilot during the war is quoted as saying:

We flew combat missions each night. With up to three-hundred kilos of bombs strapped to our wings we took off an average of 15 times a night, bombing railways, bridges, supply depots and troop positions that were heavily fortified with anti-aircraft guns . . . I could see burning planes crashing with my girlfriends in them. (Saywell as cited in Culler, 2000, p. 9)

Women served in many capacities during World War II, seeing combat on the ground and in the skies. Furthermore, many untold numbers of women fought alongside men in resistance organizations throughout Europe. According to Poyer, in his 1986 article, “G.I. Jane: Should Women be Allowed to Fight?,” “women participated with their male counterparts in every resistance organization throughout occupied Europe; they were captured, tortured, and executed by the Nazis in the same manner and proportion as men” (Poyer as cited in Culler, 2000, p. 8).

In later years, women fought alongside men in the Palmach, which was a guerilla militia organization originally designed to protect Palestine from Arab attacks during

Israel's War of Independence (Culler, 2000). The Palmach was a volunteer organization and provided the core of the Israel Defense Force (IDF). Though women in the Palmach fought bravely beside men, after the war, Israel's Prime Minister barred women from fighting in combat because it went against the Jewish concept of motherhood and the status of women in the home (Culler, 2000).

As the brief discussion above illustrates, throughout much of history, women have served their nation by taking care of the home-front. They served as nurses in the rear and on the frontlines. They have served in underground organizations that fought to undermine the opposition. Women have served in the infantry, as nurses, as pilots, and as aircrew. As societies have developed, notions of acceptable service for women have changed and their roles in the military have expanded. Women have proven themselves more than capable of fighting alongside men in many capacities, and yet further integrating women into ground combat arms is still heavily debated today within the United States.

## **2. History and Policy Review of Women Service in U.S Military**

Women have served in every war and conflict from America's birth to present day. They have served in supporting roles as volunteers and nurses, and some even hid their identities to enlist and fight with men on the frontlines. Most notably, millions of women worked in U.S. factories during World War II to replace men and support war efforts abroad. It was not until that massive war and its seemingly limitless demands that women gained official status in the U.S. military. Since then, numerous policy changes have expanded the opportunities for women in the military. As opportunities for women expanded during the latter half of the twentieth century, so did the number of women that filled the military's ranks. In the late 1990s, women saw another great increase in job opportunities when sea duties were opened on ships and women were allowed to pilot combat aircraft. Most recently, a large number of women have served in Iraq and Afghanistan, many in supporting roles, yet many experiencing more combat than ever before due to the nature of the modern-day battlefield. These wars and new perspectives on defense strategy prompted the 2013 announcement by Secretary of Defense Panetta to

rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy and remove remaining barriers to women in the military. The following sections review the service of women in the U.S. military, including a timeline of the major policy changes regarding women in the military.

*a. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*

The history of women in the U.S. military often starts with the famed story of “Molly Pitcher” during the American Revolutionary War (Culler, 2000). Though Molly’s true identity was never known, she received her nickname after numerous eyewitness accounts documented how she set aside her pitchers of water for aiding soldiers, and she took up arms and fought alongside American soldiers to defend a mortar position until reinforcements could arrive (Holm as cited in Culler, 2000). Though not as recognized as the legendary Molly Pitcher, many women of the time supported the revolution in other ways by opening their homes, providing food, repairing clothing, and aiding the wounded. At the war’s end, women continued to “serve as cooks, seamstresses, and laundresses,” until the Civil War, where many women found new opportunities to serve in the war effort (Menke, 2013, p. 4).

It was the Civil War where American women really began to make a mark on history. Most women continued to serve in the usual supporting capacities, such as cooking, doing laundry, and providing care to the wounded (Sheppard, 2007). However, many women took on new and more daring roles to support their side in the war. Women were often recruited by the Confederate and Union Armies to be spies (Culler, 2000). More directly, it is estimated that as many as 400 women disguised themselves as men by cutting their hair and dressing like men to fight on the frontline (Menke, 2013). These brave women were often not discovered unless injured or killed in battle (Menke, 2013). As Menke (2013) observes, “These women joined for many of the same reasons as men; to serve their country, make a steady wage, and to serve an honorable cause” (p. 4). After the Civil War, women continued to serve as nurses and in other limited, supporting capacities until World War I.

**b. The World Wars**

The number of women serving as nurses and in other clerical supporting positions increased from World War I to World War II. It is estimated that over 33,000 women served during the First World War and over 400,000 during the Second (Menke, 2013). During both wars, thousands of women at home in the U.S. supported the war effort by joining the labor force, producing war materials, and freeing-up able-bodied men to fight overseas.

Though women have served the nation and the military in times of conflict throughout American history, it was not until 1942 that women were granted formal military status through the establishment of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) (Culler, 2000). Women serving in WAAC received some basic indoctrination training and were educated to become clerks, mechanics, typists, cooks, and drivers, thus allowing more men to fight on the front lines (Culler, 2000). Shortly after the establishment of the WACC, the Navy created a similarly separate organization for women called the Women in Voluntary Emergency Service (WAVES). This was followed by the Women's Auxiliary Flying Squadron (WAFS), after a 1942 speech by First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt on the lack of recognition for women pilots and the amount of talent being wasted (Culler, 2000). For the remainder of the war, women pilots played a pivotal role in being test pilots and ferrying aircraft in and out of theater (Menke, 2013).

In 1943, the WAAC was renamed the Women's Army Corps (WAC), so women would not be classified as “auxiliary” (Culler, 2000). The Army Air Forces expressed the need for an “Air WAC,” and, under the lead of General Arnold, opened all Army Air Force training to women except for combat and flying schools (Culler, 2000). Approximately 40,000 women served around the world as Air-WACs (Culler citing Holm, 1982) and “more than 1070 women were hired as Civil Service pilots who formed the Women's Air Force Service Pilots (WASP) (Holm, 1982; Bateman, 1991; Dean, 1997 as cited in Culler, 2000, p. 12-13). The noteworthy contributions of women were instrumental to America's success in the war. However, full recognition wasn't forthcoming until the Women's Armed Services Act of 1948, which gave women a permanent place in the military (Culler, 2000).

*c. Post-World War II through the 1970s*

Women comprised just one percent of the force deployed to support the Korean War. When the Korean War ended and active-duty strength was cut, women's progress toward equality of service was given relatively low priority, if at all. In 1967, P.L. 90-130 modified the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 by lifting the two-percent ceiling (also called the "Two-Percent Quota") on women in the armed forces. During this time, it is estimated that 11,000 women volunteered and deployed to Vietnam, serving in many supporting capacities, including as nurses, doctors, intelligence officers, and air-traffic controllers, while thousands more provided support across the services from other parts of the world (Menke, 2013). It was also during this time that the military's Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) opened to women on a test basis, beginning with Air Force ROTC in 1969, followed by Army ROTC and Navy ROTC in 1971 (Culler, 2000; Women's Research & Education Institute, n.d.).

Although opportunities for women in the military expanded throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s, women continued to comprise less than 1 percent of the force (Burrelli, 2013). As David Burrelli (2013) of the Congressional Research Service states in a 2013 report to Congress:

Two major factors led to the expansion of the roles of women in the armed forces. First, after the end of the draft and the beginning of the All-Volunteer Force in December 1973, the military services had difficulty in recruiting and retaining enough qualified males, thereby turning attention to recruiting women. Second, the movement for equal rights for women, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, led to demands for equal opportunity in all fields, including national defense, and a gradual removal of the restrictions against them. (p. 2)

Indeed, Department of Defense records show in the FY 2011 Population Representation (POP REP) in the Military report, published by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, that, in fiscal 1972, some months before the official end of the draft, women comprised just 1.8 percent of all new recruits in the active-duty enlisted force. By the end of the following year, that proportion had risen to five percent; by 1975, it was nearly nine percent; and by 1978, it was over 12 percent (DOD POP REP, 2011). The Carter administration continued to push toward

increasing the participation of women in the military and declared a goal of having 254,300 women (or 12.5 percent) in the force by 1985 (Clemmitt, 2009). As it turned out, at the end of fiscal 1985 the active-duty force had over 209,000 female members, including 179,049 enlisted personnel (9.8 percent) and 29, 964 commissioned officers (10.4 percent) (DOD POP REP, 2011). The end of the draft and total reliance on volunteers, as seen here, led to an increased need for female recruits. This, in turn, transformed the demographic profile of the force, placing increased focus on gender issues and equality of opportunity in the military.

Among earlier actions toward opening opportunities for women, in the mid- to late-1970s, women became eligible for aviation duty in non-combat aircraft and also gained acceptance to the service academies. In addition, as Culler (2000) lists, women became eligible for co-educational basic training (1977), service in Air Force missile launch silos (1977), and sea duty (1978). At the same time, in 1976, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled in *Crawford v. Cushman* that Marine Corps regulations mandating the discharge of pregnant Marines violated the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution (citing the Women's Research & Education Institute, n.d.). In 1978, a U.S District Court ruled in *Owens v. Brown* that it was unconstitutional, based on the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause, for the Navy to completely prohibit women from serving on any Navy vessel without a more specific justification (Women's Research & Education Institute, n.d.).

#### ***d. 1980s and 1990s***

The movement toward further equality of treatment and opportunities in the military continued through the 1980s and 1990s starting with the Defense Officer Manpower Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) in 1980 (Women's Research & Education Institute, n.d.). Under DOPMA, women gained equal treatment with men in two respects. First, DOPMA abolished laws requiring that women have separate procedures for promotion, appointment, accounting, and separation. Second, it required women to compete with their male counterparts for promotion; in other words, women would now be selected to flag and general officer ranks, now competing with male

counterparts for promotion (Women's Research & Education Institute, n.d.). However, women still faced discrimination in the military, as illustrated by the confusion in Grenada in 1983 over their appropriate roles in combat.

Operation Urgent Fury in Grenada sparked increased debate concerning women's participation in the military, specifically their use in combat operations. Four women military police officers arrived shortly after the 25 October 1983 invasion, and they were returned home as soon as it became known that all women had been removed from the task force by Major General Trobaugh (Burrelli, 2013). Subsequently, women were reattached to the task force, following an intervention by Lieutenant General Mackmull, and they were redeployed on 2 November with the Task Force Lead Element to Barbados and the remainder of the Task Force to Grenada (Burrelli, 2013). Over 170 female soldiers served in Grenada on the ground and in the air as part of transport crews (Women's Research & Education Institute, n.d.). Following Grenada, women continued to serve in supporting roles in increasing numbers. Over 770 women were deployed to Panama during Operation Just Cause, serving in a variety of ground and airborne capacities. In Panama, some women had the opportunity to command troops, and one Blackhawk helicopter crew with women came under fire during the operation (Women's Research & Education Institute, n.d.).

Appendix A presents a timeline of the major policies and milestones relating to women's service in the military from 1940 to present. This timeline provides a detailed snapshot of the ways in which women have served in the military and how selected policy changes have affected their opportunities in the armed forces.

#### **C. FOREIGN (ALLIED) COUNTRIES' POLICIES ON WOMEN IN COMBAT**

Each of the four countries analyzed in the CNA study were chosen because they share some similarities with the United States in terms of military employment. Some are more open to women serving in any capacity, where the opportunity to do so exist, and others have similar restrictions to what is enforced in U.S. regulations restricting women from serving in ground combat positions. Each military has different service entities that

comprise the country's armed forces, and each has conducted studies and is either in the process of opening more service areas to women or at least reviewing the discussion from time to time based on their respective laws. The following sections summarize findings from the 2012 CNA study looking at Australia, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Israel.

In the 2012 CNA study, *Assessing the Implications of Possible Changes to Women in Service Restrictions: Practices of Foreign Militaries and Other Organizations*, researchers conducted a review of military policies and practices in Australia, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Israel (Matsel, Schulte, & Yopp, 2012). They also looked at what is called in the study, “two physically demanding professions—firefighting (including smoke jumpers) and Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) policing” (Matsel et al., 2012). The intent of the study was to gain a better understanding about the physical abilities of women and what effects gender integration may have on unit dynamics (Matsel et al., 2012). In studying each foreign military, the researchers looked at each country on the basis of military composition, women in the military, law and policy, and physical standards (Matsel et al., 2012). The researchers also reviewed any studies and reviews conducted by foreign militaries regarding the integration of women into combat jobs. They ended their review of each country with an update on the current situation at the time of publishing. This study was conducted at the request of the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps as part of an ongoing review on the restrictions to women's service in certain military occupational specialties (Matsel et al., 2012).

## **1. Composition of Women in Foreign Services**

As the United States moves forward with developing plans to further integrate women into ground combat units, it is important to study what some allied partners have done. In doing this, one focus should be to understand the composition of these foreign militaries. Every country is different and has different standards and policies for men, women, and for joining the military. In the sections that follow, information is presented on the composition of women in the respective militaries of Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Israel. By studying these four militaries, we may be able to

draw comparisons that can be used to better develop our own implementation plans for integrating women into direct ground combat units.

*a. Australian Military*

The Australian military, known as the Australian Defense Force (ADF), is comprised of three branches: the Australian Army, the Royal Australian Navy (RAN), and the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF). The ADF is an all-volunteer force, and women constitute 13.8 percent of the ADF's active-duty force (Matsel et al., 2012). For the individual services, women comprise 9.9, 18.5, and 17.1 percent of the Army, Royal Navy, and Royal Air Force, respectively (Matsel et al., 2012). Since 2010, 93 percent of all employment categories and 84 percent of billets in the ADF have been open to women (Matsel et al., 2012).

*b. Canadian Military*

Canada, similar to the United States and Australia, has an all-volunteer military force. Like Australia, the Canadian Forces consist of three major service components: the Canadian Army, the Royal Navy, and the Royal Air Force. Within Canada's military, women comprised 15 percent of personnel in 2010 (Matsel et al., 2012). The CNA study does note that 10 percent of Canadian Forces deployed in 2010 were women (Matsel et al., 2012). The proportion of women in the Canadian military has been consistent for the past 25 years, averaging around 15–16 percent (Matsel et al., 2012). However, in the Canadian military, the largest proportion of women in any field area is in the medical, dental, and support jobs, where women account for 43 percent of the officers in the medical and dental fields (Matsel et al., 2012). Women made up 38 percent of medical non-commissioned members (NMCs), 75 percent of dental NMCs, and between 20–25 percent of support NMCs between 2001 and 2007 (Matsel et al., 2012).

In the Canadian Forces, all military occupational careers are open to women. As part of Canada's human rights mission, all areas of the military were opened to women in 1989 except for submarine service, which opened to them in 2001 (Matsel et al., 2012). Canada is unique in this manner from the other countries in the study. However, Australia is close to having all parts of its military open to women, and by 2015 will join Canada in

this manner. The CNA study does mention that women can serve in any position in the Canadian military, though no women are yet serving in the elite antiterrorism unit (Matsel et al., 2012). On the other hand, women have successfully led Canadian infantry units in combat missions serving in Afghanistan.

*c. British Military*

The United Kingdom is more similar to the United States in that it restricts women from certain combat roles within its armed forces. Like Canada and Australia, the United Kingdom's military components consist of the British Army, the Royal Air Force, and the Royal Navy. The British military also has its Royal Marines, which, like the U.S. Marine Corps, falls under the Navy, but is a separate service entity. Women comprise approximately nine percent of the active duty forces within the British military (Matsel et al., 2012). More specifically, women account for 8.2, 9.3, and 12.3 percent of the British Army, the Royal Navy, and the Royal Air Force, respectively (Matsel et al., 2012). The CNA study notes that, as of 2006, 71 percent of positions in the British Army and Royal Navy were open to women, and 96 percent of positions in the Royal Air Force were open to women (Matsel et al., 2012).

*d. Israeli Military*

Israel is different from other nations studied here in that the Israeli Defense Force (IDF) is a conscript force. All men and women are required to serve upon reaching the age of 18, unless they are postponing service to continue their education (Matsel et al., 2012). The IDF is comprised of general Staff Directorates, Regional Commands, Home Front Command, and three branches: Ground Forces, Navy, and Air Force (Matsel et al., 2012). The IDF, along with the Israeli Police, oversee the Border Police. Because the IDF is a conscript force, they have a higher percentage of women serving in the IDF than do other countries examined in the study (Matsel et al., 2012). Nevertheless, in 2010 and 2011, only one-third of IDF personnel were women (Matsel et al., 2012). This number is relatively low for a military that drafts women as well as men. This difference in the ratio of men to women in the IDF is mainly due to different service requirements: two years of conscripted service for women versus three years for men (Matsel et al., 2012). The other

reason for the difference in the ratio of women to men in the IDF is that women can be more easily discharged from their service requirements because of marriage, pregnancy, or for religious reasons (Matsel et al., 2012).

As of 2006, women were eligible to serve in 88 percent of all positions within the IDF (Matsel et al., 2012). By 2009, “women could be deployed in 90 percent of IDF positions” (Matsel et al., 2012). According to an IDF report, *60 Years of Women’s Service in the IDF*, which was published in August of 2010, women made up 16 percent of artillery, 15 percent of field intelligence, 21 percent of nuclear biological and chemical (NBC) personnel, 14 percent of the K9 unit, and 68 percent of light infantry personnel in the IDF (as cited in Matsel et al., 2012). According to the CNA researchers, women accounted for the following proportions of personnel in the IDF study by area in 2011:

- 16 percent of the Air Defense Division;
- 11 percent of the Artillery Corps;
- 10 percent of Search and Rescue units;
- 6.5 percent of Border Police;
- 57 percent of the Caracal combat battalion; and
- Up to 2 percent of each Air Force squadron (Matsel et al., 2012, p. 59).

*e. Composition Summary*

The militaries of Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom, all with voluntary service, have very similar structures in their service components. As noted, Israel is the outlier here because the Israeli Defense Force is a conscript service. However, after initial conscriptions expire, individuals who are qualified can choose to remain in service. The IDF is also composed of a greater number of components and specialized services. The United Kingdom is most similar to the United States regarding exclusionary policies of women serving in ground combat arms. Like the United States, certain combat components, such as aviation, have opened to women since the early 1990s. Australia is closest to Canada in allowing women to serve in any capacity in its military. However, there is no indication that a large number of military women are interested in serving in ground combat arms or that women who might be interested are capable of meeting the physical standards required in the military specialties. Israel has different conscription

requirements for men and women, three versus two years, respectively. Furthermore, women are often transferred out of a unit due to religious beliefs of male soldiers in the units, and women are not allowed to serve in certain combat units in the IDF.

## **2. Law and Policies of Foreign Militaries**

Just as the United States has policies dictating qualification requirements and assignment rules for different jobs in the military, so do allied partners. It is important for the United States to maintain its reputation as a world leader for equal rights. As it turns out, U.S. policies toward women in the military have fallen behind those of certain allies since [give year or be more specific]. As the United States moves forward toward further integrating women, studying the policies of respected allies to see what they have done to integrate women can help in developing the nation's own implementation plans. The following sections review law and policies and provide information on how these allies got to where they are today regarding the service of women in their militaries.

### ***a. Canada***

As mentioned above, unlike the United States and the other nations in the study, Canada has no restrictions on women serving in its military. Following a human rights movement that began in the mid-1970s and continued through the 1980s, Canada opened all military occupational careers (MOCs) in 1989 to women, except for service on submarines, which opened to women in 2001 (Matsel et al., 2012). The 1989 policy change for women occurred before results were obtained from the Combat Related Employment of Women (CREW) trials, which had started in 1987 (Matsel et al., 2012). In these trials, women were allowed to serve in select ground combat units (infantry, artillery, armored, signals, and field engineering) in the Canadian Army and Royal Navy (Matsel et al., 2012). The intent of the trials was to evaluate and compare mixed gender units to all-male units over a two-year period. However, prior to the conclusion of the CREW trials, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal determined it was discriminatory to exclude women from serving in combat roles (Matsel et al., 2012). Hence, in 1989, laws were passed opening up all MOCs to women except submarines. Subsequently, as the CREW trials showed, only one out of 60 women recruited for combat roles completed the

infantry training (Matsel et al., 2012). Though women have been allowed to serve in combat roles for over 15 years in Canada, women are not “banging down the door” to serve in direct combat units, and, as of 2014, no woman has served as an assaulter in its antiterrorism unit.

***b. Australia***

In 1992, in response to the *Review of the Employment of Women in Combat and Combat Related Positions*, the Australian government opened all military positions to women except Navy clearance divers, Air Force-ground defense, and, in the Army, armor, artillery, infantry, and combat engineers (Matsel et al., 2012). This change in policy by the Australian government resulted in 87 percent of the ADF being opened to women (Matsel et al., 2012). The policy maintained the above exclusions because the positions were considered to involve direct combat duties (Matsel et al., 2012). Direct combat duties are defined by ADF Instruction PERS 32-1 as follows: “duties requiring a person to commit, or participate directly in, the commission of an act of violence against an armed adversary; and duties that would expose a person to a high probability of direct physical contact with an armed adversary” (as cited in Matsel et al., 2012).

The movement to open all MOCs to women gained new momentum in 2003 from an initiative in the Department of Defense to develop gender-neutral standards called Physical Employment Standards (PESs) as a benchmark for what is required by a specific trade in the military (Matsel et al., 2012). The PES program, though initially intended for another purpose, has assumed an informative role in the ongoing debate to remove gender restrictions on certain combat roles within the ADF (Matsel et al., 2012). Based on progress in PES studies, the Australian Defense Minister, in 2011, decided that women should be allowed to serve in frontline combat roles (Matsel et al., 2012). The Australian Cabinet established a plan allowing women to phase into combat arms over a five-year period, with remaining exclusions eliminated by the end of 2013. Australia has made significant advances toward removing restrictions on women’s service in its military and is expected to be recruiting women into all positions in the ADF by 2016.

*c. United Kingdom*

In the British military, women can serve in any capacity where the primary duty is not “to close with and kill the enemy” (Matsel et al., 2012). Therefore, women cannot be assigned to serve in the Royal Marines General Service as Royal Marine Commandos, the Household Calvary and Royal Armored Corps, the Infantry, and the Royal Air Force Regiment. However, British policy does allow women to serve alongside these units when attached to them in a supporting role. The example given in the CNA study is that female medics are able to go on patrols in combat with the platoon or company to which they are attached (Matsel et al., 2012). At the same time, they may “serve on a daily basis with the infantry units, to which they are attached, they are still technically part of the Royal Army Medical Corps, not the ground combat units” (Matsel et al., 2012). One could argue that, if women are able serve alongside ground combat units under this stipulation, the United Kingdom should simply change its policy excluding women from serving in combat units. Under the current policy, it appears that women basically do serve in ground combat units, just not in an “assaulting capacity.”

Over the past 20 years, the United Kingdom has opened more doors for women in the military by reducing the number of service capacities excluding women. The United Kingdom removed exclusions preventing women from going to sea in 1990, and removed exclusions preventing them from serving in different jet aircraft, multi-engine aircraft, and helicopter platforms in 1991 (Matsel et al., 2012). Most notably was the 1997 announcement from the Secretary of State for Defense that employment opportunities for women would be opened (Matsel et al., 2012). This announcement resulted in the British Army’s opening of all posts in the royal artillery, engineers, and electrical and mechanical engineers to women (Matsel et al., 2012). It was the combination of these three changes that allowed women to serve in over 70 percent of positions in the Naval Service and Army, and 96 percent of positions in the Royal Air Force (Matsel et al., 2012). Since then, the United Kingdom has adopted policies that require periodic review of the remaining restrictions on women’s service in the British military. In a 2002 review,

the Secretary of State for Defense concluded that current restrictions would remain in place. These same restrictions were assessed again in 2009 and 2010, and have yet to be removed.

*d. Israel*

As mentioned previously, the Israeli Defense Force is a conscript service, and both men and women are drafted to serve. Men are required to serve for three years and women are required to serve for two years. As of 2012, women were allowed to serve in non-close combat roles on a volunteer basis in the following positions within the IDF: light infantry, pilot, border patrol, air defense, artillery, combat K-9 unit, search and rescue, shallow water diving, and NBC (Matsel et al., 2012). However, women who volunteer for one of these “non-close combat” roles are required to serve for three years instead of two. These positions were made available following an Israeli Supreme Court ruling in the case of Alice Miller, a licensed commercial pilot who fought for the right to serve in the Israeli Air Force after being denied because of her gender. Following the court’s ruling in her favor, Israeli laws were amended so that “women have the same right as men to serve in every position, except those with demands that preclude women” (Cawkill as cited in Matsel et al., 2012). It is not clear what is meant by the last part of the amendment, “except those with demands that preclude women.” For example, it is unclear whether this means women are not capable of a certain job or if this is a means for commanders to justify removing women soldiers when male religious soldiers (Hesder) refuse to serve alongside women. This is not uncommon in Israel, and this tension between different groups of soldiers undermines the IDF’s ability to integrate women into combat units.

*e. Summary of Law and Policy*

Major commonality exists between the U.S. and each of the countries in the study in that they are all working toward further integrating women into combat arms. Canada opened all positions in 1989 to women except on submarines, which eventually occurred in 2001. Australia did the same in 2013 (Maginnis, 2013). The United States, United Kingdom, and Israel are all moving toward further integration, but still are not allowing

women to serve in direct ground combat positions. Under British law, women can and do serve alongside infantry units when they are attached to those units, but they are not serving directly in the infantry. Within the Israeli Defense Force, the majority of women in “non-close combat” roles serve in select units. Clearly, the trend toward gender equality will continue to put pressure on many nations to review policies regulating women serving in their armed forces.

### **3. Studies, Reviews and Physical Standards**

A key focal point of both proponents and opponents of integrating women into combat revolves around physical standards and the physical and physiological differences between men and women. The United States, along with each of these allies, has established its own standards for military entry and for the different jobs within the armed forces. In the United States, women have different physical standards than their male counterparts. This has fueled the debate because some argue that, although the standards are different, they are actually the same with respect to the amount of energy that is being used by each sex. Also, at the heart of the debate, is the subject of gender-norming, where many argue that the end result is often the “lowering” of standards (Petronio, 2012). Another topic of discussion is whether the physical standards for certain jobs are a true test of what is realistically needed to perform these jobs effectively. As the U.S. military moves forward in trying to further integrate women, lessons can be learned by studying other countries’ standards and the various paths toward policy change.

#### *a. Australia*

Like many nations, Australia has different physical fitness tests, each serving a different purpose in its military. The three primary fitness tests used in the Australian Defense Force are the Pre-Enlistment Physical Fitness Assessment (PFA), Basic Fitness Assessment (BFA), and Combat Fitness Assessment (CFA) (Matsel et al., 2012). The PFA is the test used to evaluate new recruits and officer candidates. The fitness standards on the PFA are the same for men and women, except for the push-up portion (Matsel et al., 2012). The BFA is a semi-annual fitness test taken by everyone serving in the ADF. Similar to the periodic fitness tests in the U.S. Marine Corps, the BFA has different

standards based on gender and age. The CFA is a combat assessment test used by Forces Command. It is conducted by units that are getting ready to deploy, and different standards are applied depending on the type of unit being deployed (combat versus non-combat units) (Matsel et al., 2012). The CFA is gender-neutral; however, on some portions of the test, soldiers carry differing weight amounts based on their own individual body weight (Matsel et al., 2012).

In 2005, the ADF conducted studies comparing the performance of women soldiers with that of men in the Run-Dodge-Jump (RDJ) portion of the CFA. Prior to the test, 100 percent of the men and 57 percent of the women could complete the RDJ in a rested state (Matsel et al., 2012). To test the soldiers in a non-rested state, the soldiers underwent a 15 kilometer march in which 91 percent of males and 36 percent of females completed the march in 165 minutes (Matsel et al., 2012). Following the 15 kilometer march, these soldiers performed the RDJ with a goal to complete the course in 70 seconds (Matsel et al., 2012). It was noted in the study that “all infantry soldiers and the majority (ratio not given) of combat-corps soldiers completed the RDJ within the required 70 seconds, but the fastest woman required 73 seconds to do so” (Matsel et al., 2012). By not mentioning any impact of these data, the authors of the CNA may lead readers to believe women cannot meet the same standards as men. Nevertheless, Australia and other countries working toward gender-norming need to ensure that the standards of physical testing for specific jobs are set at a level that is actually required to meet the demands of these jobs.

Australia has spent many years developing its new Physical Employment Standards (PESs), and these have contributed greatly toward removing combat exclusions for women. The final testing of the new PES program was slated to start in 2013 in conjunction with Australia’s five-year plan to remove all exclusions on women serving in the ADF, including special forces (Matsel et al., 2012). The PES is broken down into two main portions: the All-Corps Soldier (ACS) PES and the Combat Arms (CA) PES. Each PES has four assessment categories: aerobic power, anaerobic power, muscular endurance, and muscular strength (Matsel et al., 2012). For combat arms job categories (i.e., artillery, infantry, armor), soldiers must meet the standards of the CA PES or higher

criteria specified by job type. As the PES gets tested and implemented across the ADF, more current information will be available regarding the performance of women compared with that of men in this new gender-neutral system.

***b. United Kingdom***

Similar to the United States, the British military has different physical fitness standards across its services. In the Royal Marines, there is the Potential Royal Marine Course (PRMC), Commando Course/Test, and the All Arms Commando Course (Matsel et al., 2012). The PRMC and the Command Course/Test are male-only since women are currently excluded from serving in the Royal Marines as Commandos. The All Arms Commando Course is gender-neutral and is required to be passed by any person who wishes to serve in support of Royal Marine Commando units. According to the authors of the CNA study, only two women passed the All Arms Command Course as of 2012 (Matsel et al., 2012).

As mentioned previously in the law and policy section, women may go on patrols with combat units when attached to such units. This is allowed under British law, and this stipulation argues persuasively for removing all related exclusions on women serving in these units. The British Army has three main tests, as well: the Recruit Test, the Personal Fitness Assessment (PFA), and the Annual Fitness Test (AFT) (Matsel et al., 2012). The Recruit Test and the PFA are gender-neutral; however for officer recruits, the AFT is partly different for men and women. According to the CNA study, the AFT is gender-neutral, “but the load carried is heavier for combat arms (men only)” (Matsel et al., 2012, p. 25). Both branches also have other more specialized tests required by the different service specialties under combat arms.

Since the late-1990s, the United Kingdom has conducted many studies of the physical capabilities of women and men in the military. One study found that, under gender-neutral physical standards, female recruits were twice as likely as their male counterparts to suffer injuries, many of which were from overuse, such as stress fractures, tendinitis, and back pain (Matsel et al., 2012). In not wanting to abandon gender-neutral requirements, the British Army, in 2006, introduced a process known as gender-

streaming, which had male and female recruits in single-sex platoons following a training regimen that was largely the same (Matsel et al., 2012). Although this did reduce the number of female recruits discharged because of overuse injuries, it does not support the argument to remove exclusionary policies toward women. For example, if marching in stride with the men puts more stress on women's muscles and bones in recruit training, it will probably do the same in the more demanding levels of training required for combat arms.

In 2001, British ministers received a report titled *A Study of Combat Effectiveness and Gender*. This report summarized results from field tests conducted to examine the feasibility of mixed-gender and all-female tank crews and infantry units (Matsel et al., 2012). The tests were supposed to simulate combat situations to measure the reactions of men to the presence of women on the battlefield and to examine differences between genders based on how each coped with the physical demands of training (Matsel et al., 2012). According to a report provided to the Ministry of Defense, "fewer than 2 percent of female soldiers were as fit as the average male soldier" (as cited in Matsel et al., 2012, p. 33). A lot of unfavorable speculation appeared in the British media regarding the study and did not bode well for integrating women. Examples of news reports provided by the authors of the CNA study include:

- 70 percent of women failed to carry 90 pounds of artillery shells over measured distances, compared to 20 percent failure rate for men
- 48 percent of women failed, compared to 17 percent for men, to carry 60 pounds during a 12.5-mile march followed by target practice under simulated wartime conditions (Matsel et al., 2012, p. 33).

Other examples said that women had higher injury rates during hand-to-hand drills, moved slower during live fire and movement drills, and were generally unable to dig into the hard ground under fire (Matsel et al., 2012). The end result was that the Defense Ministry chose to not change the exclusion laws. Another review, *Women in the Armed Forces*, from the early 2000s, determined that there were psychological and physiological differences between men and women, and but that the primary reason to restrict women from serving in ground combat units was for combat effectiveness and cohesion (Matsel et al., 2012). Other research results from the review concluded that only

1 percent of women could achieve the performance of the average man due to differences in capacities to develop muscle and aerobic fitness (Matsel et al., 2012). Overall, the study was bleak for women, concluding that 0.1 percent of all women and only one percent of trained women could reach the established standards for ground combat positions (Matsel et al., 2012).

*c. Canada*

In Canada, physical fitness standards are gender-neutral and, as stated previously, women are allowed to serve in any capacity in the Canadian Forces (CF) as long as they meet the standards for each position. Three fitness standards (selection, maintenance, and course) are used in the Canadian military and each has its own purpose (Matsel et al., 2012). Selection standards are the most demanding and vary based on occupation. These occupations are the elite anti-terrorism unit, Joint Task Force-2, the Canadian Special Operations Regiment, the CF Department of National Defense Fire Fighters, and the Search and Rescue Technicians (Matsel et al., 2012). Maintenance standards are designed to “ensure that CF personnel attain and maintain the necessary level of physical fitness to perform common military tasks or occupation specific tasks” (Matsel et al., 2012, p. 51)). Course standards are used to ensure that personnel have a minimum physical fitness level to apply for additional certifications.

Many similarities are found between the selected countries regarding the structure of their physical standards. These standards are heavily influenced by studies each country has conducted on integrating women into military occupational specialties. It appears that the more gender-neutral a country’s military, the more gender-neutral are its fitness standards based on occupational specialty. At the same time, it also appears that each country would benefit by focusing less on the comparative performance of men and women in standardized fitness testing, and more on the fitness standards themselves, including their validity in identifying personnel who are qualified for combat-related operations.

*d. Summary of Allied Policies on Women in Combat*

Overall, the four countries in the study have many similarities in the composition of their services and the areas in which women are allowed to serve. Canada is the most gender-neutral, in that women may serve in any capacity in the Canadian military. Australia has made major advances in clearing away exclusionary policies toward women. In 2013, following a thorough review, all fields were opened to women in the ADF, including special-forces. Similar to Canada, women have shown little interest in applying for these positions, and as of April 2013, “fewer than 20 of the 8000 women in the ADF” had applied for these more physically demanding positions (Henderson, 2013). As stated previously, no woman has yet served in Canada’s antiterrorism unit, its most elite military unit. As societal views continue to change, it is expected that increasingly greater pressure will be placed on the militaries of Western democratic nations to remove exclusionary policies toward women. More research is needed to look not just at the integration of women into ground combat arms, but into the types of requirements and standards that must be met in training for these positions.

**D. SUMMARY**

This review explored the history of women in combat, describes U.S. allies’ practices and policies, and discussed definitions of combat in the context of history, practice and recent battlefield demands. Throughout history women have proven themselves on the battlefields in a multitude of ways, from wars of centuries past, to the present day. The debate surrounding the integration of women into ground combat units still exists, and has gained momentum in recent years. As the United States continues to draw down its forces in Afghanistan, the military is presented with the opportunity to look back and reflect upon the wars the Nation has fought over the last decade. In modern day battlefields, as seen in Iraq and Afghanistan, all military personnel serve in harm’s way. Servicemen and women in combat-support roles and other administrative type roles have found themselves more prone to experience combat on the ground. With friendly

force structure spread across forward operating bases (FOBs), service members operate in an environment co-located with population centers, which is where the majority of the threat in these wars exists.

Women's roles in the U.S military have expanded over time as policies changed, providing greater opportunity; often in response to mounting pressure of equal rights, but also due to the development of new roles to meet the needs of ground commanders. The perfect example of this is the use of female engagement teams. As ground commanders look for new ways to increase the effectiveness of their units, the increasing roles of women has highlighted the gap between policy and practice; further fueling the debate on women in combat. As the United States continues its move towards creating a more gender-neutral military, it is important to identify the impediments and levers to gaining stakeholder acceptance for fully integrating women into direct ground combat units. In the next chapter, the study's methods, data sources, and data are presented.

### **III. METHODOLOGY**

#### **A. INTRODUCTION**

This thesis presents a qualitative analysis of on-line media sources reports. The reports were analyzed to identify stakeholder groups and the frames they used in arguments supporting and opposing women's integration into ground combat units. A qualitative study, and in particular, frame analysis, is an appropriate approach to this study, of a broad and controversial topic, because this method allows for information to be categorized and sorted so as to focus and bring clearer understanding to the broad issues underling the debate. This chapter explains what a framing analysis is and why it is applicable to this study, and outlines the methods used to collect, sort, and analyze the data.

#### **B. FRAMING**

A frame analysis is an appropriate analytical technique to better understand phenomena that involves many social / stakeholder groups driven by different agendas. The following explanation of frames and frame analysis as a research technique is derived from W. E. Douglas Creed, Jeffrey A. Langstraat, and Maureen A. Scully's 2005 article, "A Picture of the Frame: Frame Analysis as Technique and as Politics" (Creed, Langstraat, & Scully, 2005). In this work, the authors provide a detailed background on frame analysis and also walk readers through an example of a frame analysis. This thesis utilizes the techniques as described in the above-referenced article.

The term frame can have different meanings depending on the background fields of researchers using the term and how they intend to use the technique. The "origins of frame analysis, in the work of Goffman (1974), emphasize how frames sort out and organize the stimuli of everyday life" (as cited in Creed et al., 2005, p. 36). Framing is presented by Goffman (1974) "as a day-to-day sense making technique; individuals create and rely on frames to make sense of daily interactions, conventional rituals, discourse, advertising, and other elements of social experience" (as cited in Creed et al., 2005, p. 36). Goffman's work on frame analysis has been advanced by social movement theorists, who have retained the sense making aspect, but have shifted to a greater focus

on how “individuals and groups frame contentious social issues” (Creed et al., 2005, p. 36). This focus is well suited to the focal questions of this thesis because the issue of women-in-combat has been historically contentious and the debate has been reignited in recent years.

Social movement theorists define a frame, in laymen terms, as a boundary that directs “attention to what events and texts are relevant for our understanding of an issue or situation (Creed et al., 2005, p. 36). In the works of social movement theorist, W.A. Gamson, a frame or frames are a necessary part of text—where the meaning of text includes “discourses, patterned behaviors, and systems of meaning, policy logic, constitutional principles, and deep cultural narratives” (as cited in Creed et al., 2005, p. 37). All of which in many ways represent the different aspects that surround the ongoing debate on integrating women into ground combat units.

Snow and Benford (1988) describe frames as “collections of idea elements tied together by a unifying concept that serves to punctuate, elaborate, and motivate action on a given topic” (as cited in Creed et al., 2005, p. 37). Given this,

frame analysis, then, is a technique for approaching a text by attending to its diverse idea elements with the following question: What holds these elements together? The goal of frame analysis is understanding how certain idea elements are linked together into packages of meaning, potentially encoded in to soundbite-like signifiers that stand for those packages of meaning, and deployed in situated discursive activity. (Creed et al., 2005, p. 37)

Over the years, frame analysis, has been applied by social movement scholars to many contentious issues such as abortion, the death penalty, child labor, welfare, and nuclear disarmament (Creed et al., 2005). Examples of research problems that could be explored through this application of frame analysis is how debate about welfare policy may reveal a “deeper political contest over whether the poor are lazy or deserving” (Gamson & Lasch as cited in Creed et al., 2005, p. 38), or how the “abortion debate might trace to deep underlying differences in views about who women are supposed to be in society as wives, mothers, or workers” (Luker as cited in Creed et al., 2005, p. 38).

In “A Picture of the Frame,” the authors (Creed, Langstraat, and Scully, 2005) give an example (see Table 1) of how to do a frame analysis utilizing a signature matrix. A signature matrix is one of the most basic ways to approach a framing analysis (Creed et al., 2005). They are used “for sorting the specific idea elements of a set of texts into categories” such as “metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, visual images, roots, consequences, and appeals to principle” (Creed et al., 2005, p. 39). In the example signature matrix from “A Picture of the Frame,” the authors show two different frames across the top of the matrix. These frames were identified in two texts on socially responsible investing (SRI). The categories listed above are shown in the left column of the example signature matrix. It is important to note that it is not necessary to include each of the listed categories to conduct a frame analysis. The categories selected will be dependent on the nature of the study, the depth of information in the study, and the level of analysis and focus of the research.

Table 1. Example Signature Matrix (from Creed et al., 2005, p. 41)

Table 1 Signature Matrix for Primary Frames in Socially Responsible Investing (SRI) Texts		
	<i>Social Justice Frame</i>	<i>The Marketplace of Values Frame</i>
Metaphors	Meritocracy; democracy	Marketplace of diverse values; open, respectful discourse; mutuality
Exemplars	Positive: People who value employment, housing, families, healthy lives and health insurance, freedom from violence	Positive: SRI members who embody the values of mutual respect and are a privilege to work with Negative: SRI members who set up their values up righteous and misrepresent other values that they fear
Catchphrases	The “right[s] of all people”	Tolerance, open-mindedness, mutual respect
Depictions	The rights of LGBT people	Mindful, inclusive investment; industry leaders
Visual images	None noted in this text	None noted in this text
Roots	Economic organizations can have negative effects on society; corporate social responsibility	Judging others can have negative effects; conservative Christian theology
Consequences	People suffer when investors do not act responsibly; LGBT people will suffer if SRI screens them out	Not accepting diverse values in SRI will hurt the industry
Appeals to principle	The goal is a positive impact for all; LGBT people should have the same basic human rights	Making claims of moral superiority and rejecting others' values is wrong; inclusivity and tolerance for diverse values will be the key to industry strength

*Note.* LGBT = Lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgendered.

After the completion of a signature matrix, researchers identify functional categories of the frames. Researchers must understand “that frames serve to punctuate, elaborate, and motivate action around a given issue” (Creed et al., 2005, p. 40). The punctuation function of a frame serves to define a specific problem and why it is important (Creed et al., 2005). The “elaborative function of a frame serves to attribute responsibility for the issue and to prescribe potential solutions to it” (Creed et al., 2005, p. 40). The elaborative function can also be “broken down into diagnosis and prognosis” (Snow et al., as cited in Creed et al., 2005, p. 40). The motivation function serves to encourage a specific individual or group to take some form of prescribed action. An example of how these functions are used is provided in Table 2. This example is from “A Picture of the Frame,” and is a continuation of the SRI example used in that text.

Table 2. Example Functionality Table (from Creed et al., 2005, p. 42)

	<i>Social Justice Frame</i>	<i>Marketplace of Values Frame</i>
Punctuation: What is the problem?	The problem is financial investments that contribute to an unjust society by not supporting various basic human rights.	The problem is financial investments that do not match the values of investors.
Elaboration: Who is responsible? What outcomes can be projected with or without interventions?	Investors are part of the problem when they do not track the impact on society of their investments. SRI corrects this problem by tracking the effects for investors so they can invest in organizations that have a positive impact, thereby creating a more just society.	SRI can be part of the problem if it excludes certain investors whose values are not represented. If it holds true to mutual respect for diverse beliefs, it will be part of the solution.
Motivation: What action should be taken?	Construct funds that are made up of organizations that have a positive impact for all members of society. Exclude those funds that invest in organizations that do not contribute to a more just society by excluding some members of society.	Encourage dialogue in the marketplace among varying perspectives. Create a spectrum of funds that enable diverse investors to invest in terms of their beliefs.

The final stage of frame analysis is to put the frames into context. Continuing with the SRI example from “A Picture of the Frame,” the phrases “socially responsible” and “investing around our values” can take on different meanings depending on which stakeholder or group is using the phrase and the context in which they use it (Creed et al., 2005, p. 42). This gives frame sponsors the ability to use frames differently depending on the forum and intended audience. This is important because an individual or group’s understanding of reality will be based on their perception of the meaning of different phrases.

Frame analysis is a commonly used analytical tool for conducting qualitative research on social movements and policy. It provides a method for compiling and then dissecting information surrounding a given topic - such as integrating women into ground combat units. By identifying common terms and themes, frames and social groups can be identified. Furthermore, frames can be categorized according to theme and functionality, both of which allow for a deeper understanding of the arguments and underling logic presented by the various social groups. Furthermore, researchers can evaluate frames in different contexts in order to better understand the motivations behind stakeholder’s arguments. Thus, frame analysis is a technique used to highlight key elements and drivers in a debate and thereby suggest avenues to further legitimacy of a particular position.

### **C. DATA AND SAMPLING**

The data for this study were on-line media from a Google Search of “Women in Combat.” The on-line search and resulting data included a variety of media and other source types available on the web. Though this study is focused on the integration of women into ground combat units, it was determined that searching more broadly on “Women in Combat” would provide a more in-depth pool of data that would accurately capture the different stakeholders, issues and arguments surrounding the debate. In order to conduct a frame analysis, the data pool must contain sources that represents and captures who the stakeholders are, what their arguments are, and the implications and drivers present in the debate.

The Google Search of “Women in Combat” was limited to the time period of January 1, 2012 to January 31, 2014. This 25 month period was chosen for encompassing a timespan where the debate on women in direct ground combat saw increased attention in the media from two lawsuits brought against the Defense Department, the growing gap between policy and reality on the ground in Afghanistan, and the decision to open thousands of new positions to women that would bring them closer to the frontlines in the current war. This time period proved to be sufficient because theoretical saturation—“the point at which incremental learning is minimal because the researchers are observing phenomena seen before”—is reached (Glaser & Strauss as cited in Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 545). In other words, the same stakeholders, issues, and themes appeared time and time again; solidifying that saturation had been achieved and the timeframe was sufficient for the purpose of this thesis (Eisenhardt, 1989).

The Google search resulted in 229 links across 22 google search pages. Of those, 164 were relevant to this study. The remaining links were discarded because they were not actually about the focal topic. For example, one link on Google search page number 21 was titled, “Nike Store, Men’s Clearance Shoes, Clothing and Gear.” If a link to an article or media site did not work, then that data point was discarded. A data point in this study refers to a specific source such as an article, report, or blog post. All but one of the 164 collected data points came from the first 18 Google search pages. It is important to note that Google searches list links based on number of times a source is viewed, not by date published or other metrics.

#### **D. ANALYSIS APPROACH**

A total of 164 data points were collected and analyzed. After reading each source (such as news articles, reports, policies, and blogs), summary information was inputted into a master data file. An example of how the data was sorted and labeled is provided below in Table 3. The column headings in Table 3 represent the following: date the data point was published; source of the data point; preference or stance on integrating women into ground combat units (pro/con/neutral); key terms or possible frames identified in the data point; and the topic/themes evident in the data point. A final column, summary (not

depicted in Table 3), contained a summary of each data point written by the researcher. This column was important because it helped the researcher gain a better understanding and make note of the key points and other pertinent information in each data point.

Table 3. Example of Master Data Source Sheet

Date	Title	Author	Source	Stance	Term	Topic/Theme
13-Feb-14	Women in Combat (2/6/2013)	Walter E. Williams	<i>TownHall.com</i>	Con	Gender neutral playing Field, discrimination	Tries to pick apart DOD theme of "gender-neutral"
18-Jun-13	Pentagon says women in all combat units by 2016	CNN Staff	<i>CNN Politics</i>	Neutral	Removing barriers	DOD remains committed to removing barriers
24-Jan-13	Valor Knows No Gender': Pentagon Lifts Ban on Women in Combat	Erin McClam	<i>NBC News</i>	Pro	Nation's ideals of fairness and equality	Women already serve on frontlines but not recognized for it
1-Mar-13	The Truth about Women in Combat	David Brum	<i>The Daily Beast</i>	Con	Fairness - not the military's job	ideology, reality based community
24-Jan-13	Women in Combat? Pentagon Says Yes	Jim Michaels, Tom Vanden Brook, William M. Welch	<i>USA Today</i>	Pro	The right thing to do"	Today's battlefield - all serving are in combat
7-Mar-13	Seven Myths about "Women in Combat"	LtGen (Ret) G.S. New Bold	<i>Michael Yon Online Magazine</i>	Con	"It's about women in Combat," "It's just fair"	Debunks "7 myths" around topic of women in combat.
23-Jan-13	Pentagon Removes Ban on Women in Combat	Ernesto Londoño	<i>The Washington Post</i>	Neutral/ pro	Paradigm shift	Review of announcement to rescind exclusionary policies from 1994.

Following creation of the master data sheet, the data was analyzed to identify key themes, arguments, stakeholder groups, patterns and trends. Key topics and arguments in the ongoing debate that were main points of contention between social groups were identified. Examples of key topics included, incident related combat versus direct ground combat; making policy match reality, or gender-norming and gender-equality. Further, the data were examined to identify patterns following milestone events such as the January 2013 announcement by former Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, to lift the combat ban on women. The quantity and stance of coverage following milestone events provides a further means to identify trends in the debate. Finally, counts of the total

number of articles for and against integrating (i.e., pro/con/neutral) women into ground combat units, allowed conclusions to be drawn regarding the stances of political groups and society as a whole during the time period for which the data was collected.

By categorizing the data points and identifying the major themes, key terms, stakeholders and arguments presented in the data set this analysis illuminates major influences, key barriers, and possible levers for promoting this change in military policy. The frame analysis provides a lens to increase understanding of the impediments and drivers behind the further integration of women into ground combat units. As the U.S. military moves forward towards developing plans and further integrating women in ground combat specialties, understanding of the implications can allow for recommendations to be developed on how to best implement these changes and to what levels in the military.

## IV. ANALYSIS

### A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes an analysis of the debate on the decision to rescind the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy and to integrate women into direct ground combat units. The analysis identifies key stakeholders, frames, underlying values and assumptions, and the arguments of proponents and opponents. Each of these is described and explained below.

### B. STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFIED IN DATA SET

The intent of the stakeholder analysis is to identify the key groups and individuals that are contributing to the ongoing debate on integrating women into direct ground combat forces. The stakeholder analysis categorizes stakeholders as proponents or opponents of integrating women into direct ground combat units. The analysis is focused on groups specifically named in the data set, and thus does not include the American public and the military services in general. It is important to note, however, that both of these general groups are considered important audiences and are thus discussed in subsequent sections of the analysis.

#### 1. Proponent Stakeholders

The analysis identifies six key stakeholder groups that are proponents of the decision to rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy and remove the last official barriers to women in the military. The six proponent stakeholders are as follows: the Service Women's Action Network (SWAN); the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS); American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) Women's Rights Project; the President of the United States, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) and Chairman of the JCS (CJCS); and the Secretary of Defense (SecDef).

##### a. *Service Women's Action Network*

Service Women's Action Network (SWAN) is a nonpartisan civil rights organization that focuses on promoting change and fighting discrimination and violence

against women in the military by challenging the institution and cultural norms that deny equal opportunities, protections, and benefits to service members and veterans. As stated on its website,

SWAN's mission is to transform military culture by securing equal opportunity and freedom to serve without discrimination, harassment or assault; and to reform veterans' services to ensure high quality health care and benefits for women veterans and their families. (SWAN, n.d.)

As illustrated in the examples below, SWAN authored articles strongly supporting the integration of women into ground combat positions and the group is often attacked by opponents of integration. The SWAN representatives referenced most frequently in the data set include Anu Bhagwati (Executive Director and Co-Founder), Greg Jacob (Policy Director), and Zoe Bedell (member of SWAN's Military Advisory Council). Of these three SWAN representatives, Bhagwati and Jacob are cited most often within the data set.

In March 2013, SWAN (no author noted) posted an article on its website, "Women in Combat," that depicts its proponent stance and illustrates how it frames the debate around fairness and also ties fairness to effectiveness. In this article, SWAN states its position:

SWAN believes that the most effective military is one where women are integrated into all sectors. SWAN advocates for one single physical fitness standard for both men and women, and for occupational standards that are task-oriented and gender-neutral. Additionally, SWAN believes that women should be eligible for Selective Service. (SWAN, 2013, p. 1-2)

SWAN also states in the article that the "combat exclusion policy reflected an enormous gap between Defense Department policy and the reality on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan" and that "the policy not only legalized sex discrimination, it also helped foster a hostile work environment in which sexual harassment and sexual assault have been allowed to thrive" (SWAN, 2013, p. 1). The article also notes how SWAN believes the exclusion policy acted as a "glass ceiling," preventing women from serving in tactical career fields that generally lead to achieving flag and general officer ranks (SWAN, 2013).

Similarly, in a February, 2012, article posted on SaukValley.com titled “Sources: Pentagon Rules Shift on Women in Combat,” Lolita C. Baldor cites Bhagwati regarding news about plans unveiled by the Defense Department to allow women to serve closer to the frontlines in thousands of military jobs (Baldor, 2012). Speaking for SWAN, Bhagwati said “this is a huge step in the right direction” (as cited in Baldor, 2012, p. 3). Though this is a “huge step in the right direction,” Bhagwati said it was “extremely disappointing” that women are still going to be excluded from the infantry (as cited Baldor, 2012, p. 3). Bhagwati believes “to continue such a ban is to ignore the talents and leadership that women bring to the military, and it further penalizes service women by denying them the opportunity for future promotions and assignments that are primarily given to personnel from combat arms specialties” (as cited in Baldor, 2012, p. 3).

Greg Jacob, the Policy Director for SWAN, was quoted by David Ferguson in his July 2012 article, “Service Women’s Group Critical of Anti-’Women in Combat’ Editorial. This article emphasizes the proponent position discussing and refuting comments made by a Marine Corps Captain, Katie Petronio, who wrote an article published in the *Marine Corps Gazette*, titled “Get Over It! We are Not All Created Equal.” Ferguson quotes a statement by Greg Jacob to *Raw Story*, responding to Captain Petronio’s article, as follows:

Being a combat experienced, male infantrymen...I can tell you that for the U.S. Marines to adopt a policy that ensures the best of the best, regardless of gender, are leading Marines in combat, will improve the fighting ability of the Marine Corps and will not degrade readiness, or compromise national security. (as cited in Ferguson, 2012, p. 2)

Ferguson goes on to note that Jacob compares removing combat exclusions on women to racial integration in the military in the 1940s and to the more recent decision to rescind the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy (as cited in Ferguson, 2012) and implies that women will gain equality: “Fortunately for critics of change, a rising tide lifts all boats” (Jacob as cited in Ferguson, 2012, p. 2).

Opponents of integration criticize SWAN’s position. For example in the book, *Deadly Consequences* (2013), Robert Maginnis quotes Bhagwati: “When you have legalized discrimination against women, there’s no doubt in my mind that there’s a link

there [with sexual harassment and assault]" (as cited in Maginnis, 2013, p. 143). Maginnis then goes on to criticize this position, saying "the idea that throwing men and women into uninterrupted intimacy under the highest imaginable stress is a prescription for reducing sexual harassment and assault is an affront to common sense" (Maginnis, 2013, p. 143). Simply put, Maginnis would argue that integrating women in direct ground combat units to somehow fix the sexual harassment and assault issues in the military is an asinine idea.

***b. Defense Advisory Committee for Women in the Services***

The Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) is responsible for advising the Secretary of Defense on policies and other matters pertaining to women in the military. DACOWITS was established in 1951 to "heighten awareness and recruitment of women" into the armed forces (Culler, 2000, p. 13) (see Appendix A for a timeline). According to the DACOWITS website,

The Committee provides an invaluable service to the Department as an independent body of citizen advisors. The Committee provides an annual report to the Secretary of Defense with information gathered through installation visits, business meetings, relevant reports and survey data, and input from individual Service members. This combination of research and first-hand experiences provides a solid basis for each DACOWITS recommendation. (DACOWITS, 2014)

Recommendations put forward by DACOWITS have historically been "instrumental in effecting changes to laws and policies pertaining to military women" (DACOWITS, 2014).

An example of DACOWITS' support for rescinding the 1994 Exclusion Policy and for integrating women into direct ground combat units can be seen in how DACOWITS' members voted unanimously to support the following recommendation:

DOD should eliminate the 1994 ground combat exclusion policy and direct the Services to eliminate their respective rules, thereby ending the gender-based restrictions on military assignments. Concurrently, the DOD and the Services should open all related career fields, specialties, schooling and training opportunities that have been closed to women. ("DACOWITS Quarterly," 2012, p. 9)

DACOWITS' proponent stance in the debate is made clear in Captain Petronio's 2012 article, "Get Over It! We Are Not All Created Equal," where she offers several arguments on why women should not be allowed in the infantry and other direct ground combat units. In her article, Petronio discusses how the push behind this agenda is not coming from women "pounding on the doors of Congress claiming that their inability to serve in the infantry violates their rights to equality. . . shockingly, this isn't even a Congressional agenda (Petronio, 2012, p. 2). Rather, this "issue is being pushed by several groups, one of which is a small committee of civilians appointed by the Secretary of Defense called DACOWITS" (Petronio, 2012, p. 2). At the time her article was written, the Exclusion Policy had not been rescinded, but the Defense Department had gone forward opening several thousand positions to women that brought them closer to the frontlines. Petronio later notes, "as of now the Marine Corps has not been directed to integrate, but perhaps the Corps is anticipating the inevitable—DOD pressuring the Corps to comply with DACOWITS agenda" (Petronio, 2012, p. 2). In other words, she can read the writing on the wall. Her article demonstrates that DACOWITS, based on its composition in 2012, is a major proponent of integrating women into direct ground combat units.

*c. American Civil Liberties Union Women's Rights Project*

The American Civil Liberties Union's (ACLU) Women's Rights Project is a specific arm within the ACLU that has worked with other feminist activist organizations to shape policy change that would expand the roles of women in the military, primarily in the cause of fairness and equality. From its website, the ACLU describes itself as "our nation's guardian of liberty, working daily in courts, legislatures and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights"—specifically mentioning the "right to equal protection under the law" to prevent unlawful discrimination and "liberties that the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country" (ACLU, n.d.).

The ACLU stance on the debate surrounding the decision to rescind the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy on women is made clear in a statement by Ariela Migdal, a

senior staff attorney with the ACLU Women’s Rights Project, who was quoted by Jenna Goudreau’s January 2013 *Forbes* article, “Will Allowing Women in Combat Roles Revolutionize Military Leadership?” In her article, Goudreau quotes Ariela Migdal, stating:

I am thrilled to hear the Secretary is taking a huge step towards having the policy reflect women’s hard fought service. For the past ten years, women have been slogging it out in Iraq and Afghanistan. It’s a great step to conform the policy to reality. (as cited in Goudreau, 2013, p. 1)

Another example, mentioning the ACLU’s legal support to the proponent side and effects in the political arena, is captured in Susan Hennessey’s January 2013 article in *Lawfare*, where she implies that the direct ground combat rule had become a “political hot potato” when the “ACLU sued [Defense Secretary] Panetta on behalf of four service women to challenge the policy as discriminatory” (Hennessey, 2013, p. 1).

*d. President of the United States*

The following statements by President Barack Obama exemplify the administration’s principal rationale for removing the combat exclusion provision, made after Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and General Martin Dempsey announced that the ban would be lifted: (1) “Another step towards fulfilling our Nation’s founding ideals of fairness and equality” (as cited in McClam, 2013, p. 2); and (2) “Today by moving to open more military positions—including ground combat units—to women, our armed forces have taken another historic step towards harnessing the talents and skill of all our citizens” (as cited in Piper, 2014, p. 1). Both of these clearly show the President’s support and are used by proponents to frame and boost arguments in the ongoing debate.

On the other hand, some opponent-authors are harsh critics of President Obama’s administration, senior military and DOD leaders, and feminist groups supporting the integration of women in combat. One such critic, retired Army Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Maginnis, provides his views in a recent book, *Deadly Consequences: How Cowards are Pushing Women into Combat*. In the introduction, Maginnis (2013) affirms his position and sets the tone:

The Obama administration has set a deliberate course to change the very nature of the United States military. On January 24, 2013, just before stepping down as secretary of defense, Leon Panetta ended the exclusion of women from direct ground combat. If implemented as planned by 2016, this policy will erode the military's warrior culture and its ability to defend America. The commander in chief's decision to assign women to direct ground combat units is contradicted by science, all empirical data, the experiences of other nations, and common sense. (p. ix)

*e. Joint Chiefs of Staff and Chairman JCS*

The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), General Martin Dempsey, accompanied Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta when he made the announcement to lift the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy, supported by a unanimous recommendation from the Joint Chiefs. According to the official JCS website (<http://www.jcs.mil/>):

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the principal military adviser to the President, Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council (NSC), however, all JCS members are by law military advisers, and they may respond to a request or voluntarily submit, through the Chairman, advice or opinions to the President, the Secretary of Defense, or NSC. Responsibilities as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff take precedence over duties as the Chiefs of Military Services. (JCS, 2014)

The Chairman and other members of the JCS represent the military services and are the "ambassadors" who fight on Capitol Hill for all service members. Critics of the decision to integrate women into ground combat have accused current military leaders of succumbing to pressure by feminist organizations or political influences. For example, Dempsey's statement, "We'll integrate women in a way that enhances opportunities for everyone," has been criticized by Maginnis (2013) in *Deadly Consequences*, where he claims "our senior generals are showing moral cowardice in the face of the enemy by failing to speak out against and ideological initiative that will harm readiness and troop morale" (p. ix). This is further supported in statements made by retired Lieutenant General Jerry Boykin, former commander of the U.S. Army's Delta Force and Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence. According to General Boykin, General Dempsey and the Joint Chiefs "are in their positions because they agreed to support these

policies” and “have shown a lack of courage to stand up to the administration when it is clear the policies do not enhance readiness” (as cited in Maginnis, 2013, p. 7).

*f. Secretary of Defense*

As the head of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, according to the DOD official website (<http://www.defense.gov>), provides “the military forces needed to deter war and to protect the security of our country” (as cited by DOD). The Secretary of Defense is the appointed leader of the largest employer in the United States, comprising the military services and numerous other government organizations operated by over 700 thousand civilian employees (as cited by DOD).

Clearly, former Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, is a proponent stakeholder. Many of the proponent-side articles refer to the following comments by Panetta during the January 2013 press conference where he and General Dempsey announced an end to the Combat Exclusion Policy: (1) “Purpose is to ensure that the mission is carried out by the best qualified and the most capable service members, regardless of gender” (as cited in “DOD Memos,” 2013, p. 2) and (2) “Not everyone is going to be able to be a combat soldier, but everyone is entitled to a chance” (as cited in “DOD Memos,” 2013, p. 2). The Secretary of Defense is a powerful position and is surrounded by the influences of politics. The words and actions of those holding this office often become a catalyst for discussion in this ongoing debate.

Table 4 provides a summary of the proponent-stakeholder analysis. The six major stakeholders are shown, along with a brief description of their background and examples of statements or actions that represent their position on the policy change. As seen here, the example statements and rationale of proponent-stakeholders emphasize gender equity, aligning reality with policy, fairness, and equal opportunities for women service members.

Table 4. Proponent-Stakeholders of Integrating Women into Direct Ground Combat Units

	Definition / Background of Stakeholder	Example Statements
SWAN (director is Greg Jacobs)	The Service Women's Action Network (SWAN) mission is to transform military culture by securing equal opportunity and freedom to serve without discrimination, harassment or assault; and to reform veterans' services to ensure high quality health care and benefits for women veterans and their families.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Combat exclusion reflected the gap between DOD policy and reality on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan (SWAN, 2013).</li> <li>- Combat exclusion policy legalized sex discrimination, fostered hostile work environment where sexual harassment and assault thrive, and is an institutional glass ceiling for women in military (SWAN, 2013).</li> </ul>
Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Committee is composed of civilian women and men who are appointed by the SecDef to provide advice and recommendations on matters and policies relating to the recruitment and retention, treatment, employment, integration, and well-being of highly qualified professional women in the Armed Forces" (<a href="http://dacomits.defense.gov">http://dacomits.defense.gov</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DACOWITS concurred with the 2011 recommendation of the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC) to eliminate combat exclusion policies for women.</li> <li>- DACOWITS members voted unanimously to support the following recommendation: DOD should eliminate the 1994 ground combat exclusion policy and direct the Services to eliminate their respective rules, thereby ending the gender-based restrictions on military assignments. Concurrently, the DOD and the Services should open all related career fields, specialties, schooling and training opportunities that have been closed to women" ("DACOWITS Quarterly," 2012, p. 9).</li> </ul>
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) - specifically the ACLU Women's Rights Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "The ACLU is our nation's guardian of liberty, working daily in courts, legislatures and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country" (<a href="https://www.aclu.org">https://www.aclu.org</a>).</li> <li>- Specifically notes right to equal protection under the law - protection against unlawful discrimination (ACLU).</li> <li>- "The ACLU works to extend rights to segments of our population that have traditionally been denied their rights, including people of color; <u>women</u>, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender people" (ACLU).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ariela Migdal, senior staff attorney with ACLU Women's Rights Project, says "for the past 10 years women have been slogging it out in Iraq and Afghanistan. It's a great step to conform the policy to reality."</li> <li>- The ACLU is representing 4 service women, who are joined by SWAN, in a November 2012 lawsuit being filed against the Defense Department for "violating their rights to equal protection under the law by maintaining policies collectively known as the combat exclusion rule" (O'Toole, 2012).</li> </ul>
President of the United States (POTUS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary role is Command and Chief of the Armed Forces. Secondary roles include head of Executive Branch, head of State and head of respective political party.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "another step towards achieving the nation's ideals of fairness and equality" (President Obama).</li> <li>- "Today by moving to open more military positions - including ground combat units - to women, our armed forces have taken another historic step towards harnessing the talents and skill of all our citizens" (President Obama).</li> </ul>
Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) - headed by General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The CJCS is the principal military adviser to the President, SecDef, and National Security Council (NSC), however, all JCS members are by law military advisers, and they may respond to a request or voluntarily submit, through the Chairman, advice or opinions to the President, the SecDef, or NSC.</li> <li>- The military Service Chiefs are often said to "wear two hats." As members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they offer advice to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the NSC. As the chiefs of the Military Services, they are responsible to the Secretaries of their Military Departments for management of the Services. The Service Chiefs serve for 4 years. The duties of the Service Chiefs as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff take precedence over all their other duties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "We'll integrate women in a way that enhances opportunities for everyone" (General Dempsey).</li> <li>- "Eliminate all unnecessary gender-based barriers to service" (General Dempsey).</li> <li>- "women are serving in combat and have been (General Dempsey)</li> <li>- "the burden used to be that we would say, why should a woman serve in a particular specialty? Now it's, why shouldn't a woman serve in a particular specialty?" (General Dempsey).</li> </ul>
Secretary of Defense (SecDef)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Head of the Defense Department. Influential SecDef's surrounding this debate is Les Aspin (early 1990s), Leon Panetta (rescinded 1994 Exclusion Policy) and his successor, current SecDef, Chuck Hagel (left with having to implement and execute these changes).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intent is that the most qualified and capable service members, regardless of gender, are selected for combat roles (Panetta, 2013)</li> <li>- "Not everyone can be a combat soldier, but everyone deserves a chance" (Panetta, 2013).</li> </ul>

## **2. Opponent Stakeholders**

The analysis identifies three key stakeholder groups that oppose the decision to rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy and integrating women into direct ground combat units. The first group, the Center for Military Readiness, is an independent, non-partisan group that conducts studies and recommends policies affecting the military. The second group consists of female service members, both active duty and veterans, who have chosen to speak out against integrating women into direct ground combat. The last group consists of retired (male) military officers, many of whom have extensive combat experience and have held a number of command positions.

### ***a. Center for Military Readiness***

The Center for Military Readiness (CMR) is one of the most active and vocal critics of integrating women into direct ground combat units. According to the CMR mission statement on (<http://www.cmrlink.org>):

CMR is an independent, non-partisan, public policy organization with a unique mission. CMR promotes high standards and sound priorities in the making of military personnel policies, and takes the lead in defending elements of military culture that are essential for morale and readiness in the All-Volunteer Force. (CMR, 2014)

CMR was founded in 1993 and is currently headed by Elaine Donnelly, who has a long history of public service in advisory roles supporting the military and military policies towards women. Donnelly served as a member of DACOWITS (a proponent-stakeholder in this ongoing debate) from 1984 to 1986 (CMR, 2014). In 1992, Donnelly was appointed by President Bush to the Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces (CMR, 2014). Elaine Donnelly has been very vocal in contesting policies placing women into more frontline roles. Donnelly supports female troops, and acknowledges the work and sacrifices made by women, especially their performance in non-traditional roles over the past decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan (Donnelly, 2013). Donnelly draws the distinction that, although all troops serve “in harm’s way,” the experiences of those serving in units with a primary mission of direct

ground combat are far different from those who serve in combat support roles (Donnelly, 2013).

As an independent organization focused on public policies affecting women, CMR relies heavily on past and current research studies to provide evidence supporting their position and to discredit arguments made by proponents of integrating women into direct ground combat units. The CMR website (<http://www.cmrlink.org>) contains link after link of published articles and recommended policies CMR has submitted to lawmakers and military leaders. Regarding the debate on integrating women into direct ground combat units, CMR is one of the most outspoken opponents that tries to frame the debate around the different physical capabilities of men and women, distinguishing between incident-related service (serving in harm's way) and direct ground combat, and by arguing that gender-normed diversity metrics lower overall standards in the military (CMR, 2013).

***b. Female Service Members and Veterans***

Within this second opponent-stakeholder group, two women stand out most. The first is Captain Katie Petronio, an active duty Marine with frontline combat experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, and author of the July 2012 article, “Get over It! We are Not all Created Equal,” which first appeared in the *Marine Corps Gazette* and has been widely-cited in other opponent-side articles. The second is Jude Eden, a former Marine and military police (MP) woman and veteran of the Iraq War. In her column, “According to Jude,” published on *Political Animal*, an online news resource, she has written several articles discussing the debate on women in combat. Five of her articles appear in the analytical data set, with one of those published twice, once on *Political Animal* and again on *The Western Center for Journalism*.

Clearly, Captain Petronio is an opponent of integrating women into direct ground combat units. During her deployments, Captain Petronio had the opportunity to serve in unique capacities on the frontlines and “was able to participate in and lead numerous combat operations” (Petronio, 2012, p. 1). According to Captain Petronio, any policy changes allowing women to serve in direct ground combat units, such as the infantry or

special forces, would “rock the foundation of our Corps for worse and will weaken what has been since 1775 the world’s most lethal fighting force” (Petronio, 2012, p. 4).

During her 10-month deployment in Iraq, Petronio served as the director of the II MEF (Marine Expeditionary Force) Lioness Program and was responsible for assisting senior ground commanders in integrating female Marines into combat operations (Petronio, 2012). According to Petronio (2012), as the II MEF Lioness Program director, she “primarily focused on expanding the mission of the Lioness Program in (same as female engagement teams in Afghanistan) from searching females to engaging local nationals and information gathering, broadening the ways females were being used in a wide variety of combat operations from census patrols to raids” (p. 2). In her second combat deployment, Petronio deployed to Helmand Province, Afghanistan, where she spent seven months leading a combat engineer platoon in direct support of Regimental Combat Team (RCT) 8 in the Upper Sangin Valley (Petronio, 2012). During the timeframe of her deployment in support of RCT 8, the Sangin Valley became one of the most kinetic and contested areas for Marines since the start of the war in Afghanistan.

Petronio’s position as an opponent-stakeholder in the debate is based largely on her own combat experiences, having been diagnosed with restless leg syndrome due to having her spine compressed on nerves in her lower back from constantly carrying the weight of her combat load over her 10 months in Iraq (Petronio, 2012). However, according to Petronio, Iraq was not nearly as physically demanding as her seven-month deployment to Afghanistan (Petronio, 2012). In Afghanistan, Petronio noticed how her body was breaking down at a more rapid rate than that of male Marines after spending weeks in the field, building one patrol base (PB) after another (Petronio, 2012). In her article, Petronio (2012) writes:

By the fifth month into the deployment, I had muscle atrophy in my thighs that was causing me to constantly trip and my legs to buckle with the slightest grade change. My agility during firefights and mobility on and off vehicles and perimeter walls was seriously hindering my response time and overall capability. It was evident that stress and muscular deterioration was affecting everyone regardless of gender; however, the rate of my deterioration was noticeably faster than that of male Marines and further compounded by gender-specific medical conditions. At the end of the 7-

month deployment, and the construction of 18 PBs later, I had lost 17 pounds and was diagnosed with polycystic ovarian syndrome (which personally resulted in infertility, but is not a genetic trend in my family), which was brought on by the chemical and physical changes endured during deployment. (p. 4)

Petronio (2012), a former “star hockey player at Bowdin College,” adds that her “main concern is not whether women are capable of conducting combat operations”—(because women have been for over a decade serving in a variety of different and non-traditional combat support roles)—but, instead, her “main concern is an issue of longevity” (p. 2).

Proponents of integration have responded directly to Petronio’s arguments. For example, David Ferguson, in a July 2012 article on *The Raw Story*, quotes Petronio’s article where she states, “as a combat-experienced Marine officer, and a female, I am here to tell you that we are not all created equal, and attempting to place females in the infantry will not improve the Marine Corps as the Nation’s force-in-readiness or improve our national security” (as cited in Ferguson, 2012, p. 2). Ferguson then proceeds to cite comments by a former Marine infantryman, Greg Jacob, who is the policy director for SWAN and a leading proponent-stakeholder in the debate, to refute Petronio’s position.

Similar to Petronio, Jude Eden has personal combat experience. She makes this clear to her readers in the opening paragraph of her article, “The Problem(s) of Women in Combat,” where she describes her experiences in Iraq serving as an MP, working with the “grunts” (a nickname for Infantry members) on a daily basis, running vehicle checkpoints around Fallujah, an area that saw some of the most vicious fighting experienced by U.S troops since the Vietnam War (Eden, 2013). Later in the same article, Eden (2013) offers arguments similar to those presented by Captain Petronio, stating that “those pushing women into combat” don’t want to admit the truth—men and women are different, and that is why men and women have different standards in the military (p. 1).

Eden’s stance as an opponent-stakeholder is again made clear in another of her articles, “Careerists v. Mother Nature.” Here, she faults politically-motivated feminist groups driving personal agendas and senior military officials, especially female officers, who place personal gain above the greater good of military. According to Eden (2013),

advocates of placing women in combat should recognize that “the military is about preparing for and executing war, not advancing your career at the cost of readiness for war” (p. 1). Within one month of the announcement to rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy, Eden posted four opposing articles to *Political Animal*. More recently, Eden posted an article, “Women Fail to Achieve Male Marines’ Lowest Standard,” in January 2014, one week shy of the first anniversary of the Exclusion Policy announcement, addressing how the Marine Corps is delaying plans to integrate a three pull-up requirement (in place of a flexed-arm hang) for females after more than half the new recruits in 2013 failed to meet the new standard (Eden, 2014).

*c. Retired Military Officers Most Noted in Data Set*

The third and final opponent stakeholder group identified during analysis consists of retired servicemen, many of whom have extensive combat experience and have held a number of command positions. Collectively, this opponent-stakeholder group captures the main arguments and issues presented in the analytical data set by the opponent stance on integrating women into direct ground combat units. This group is very critical of the decisions and path that the current administration and senior military leaders have taken regarding this issue. The four stakeholders in this group that appear most in the analytical data set are as follows: retired Army Lieutenant General William “Jerry” Boykin; retired Army Major General Patrick Brady; retired Army Lieutenant Colonel and former Congressman, Allen West; and retired Army Lieutenant Colonel and author, Robert Maginnis.

Lieutenant General Boykin is an original member of the Army’s elite Special Forces unit, Delta Force, and is a former commander of the Army’s Special Operations Command. During his stellar military career, Boykin saw combat and participated in many conflicts around the globe. Since retiring from the Army, Boykin has served as the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence and is currently serving as the Executive Vice President of the Family Research Council (FRC), whose mission, according to the FRC website (<http://www.frc.org>) is “to advance faith, family and freedom in public policy and the culture from a Christian worldview” (FRC, n.d.) Boykin is a devout Christian,

and his stance in the debate reflects his personal experiences as well as his personal beliefs, which he acknowledges in comments.

Analysis shows that Boykin has been a constant figure on the opponent side of the debate. His opposing position is made clear in a national news interview on *Fox News*, where he debated the decision to rescind the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy with Colonel Martha McSally, the “nation’s first female combat pilot” (*The Right Scoop*, 2013, p. 2). In the debate, Boykin, in a response to being asked to “look into the camera and explain to McSally why she is unfit to serve in combat,” stated:

Well, Chris, you need to frame it correctly. It’s not an issue of women in combat. Women are in combat already and have been since 9/11, in fact, prior to that. And Colonel McSally is a great example of how women can be used in combat. My issue here is, mixing the genders in infantry units, armored units, and Special Forces units is not a positive. There are many distractors there, which put a burden on small unit combat leaders, and actually creates an environment because of their living conditions that is conducive to readiness. (Boykin as cited in *The Right Scoop*, 2013, p. 2)

Boykin’s comments show that he supports women serving in combat in supporting roles, but does not support the integration of women into direct ground combat units. He consistently argues that the most important issues, such as the effects of a policy change on readiness, are not receiving the most attention by proponents of lifting the exclusion. This argument further solidifies his opposing position in the debate, including Boykin’s following clarification:

A female that can run a marathon does not necessarily translate into a female who can drag a man, let’s just say an average man of 175 pounds, with all of his combat gear. It is not the average female that will be able to do that. So it’s a readiness issues and no one is considering readiness. (as cited in Webb & Winborn, 2013, p. 2)

This again shows that Boykin opposes integrating women into direct ground combat units. His arguments focus primarily on military readiness, as opposed to the arguments presented by many proponents of removing the exclusion, which tend to highlight fairness, gender equality, and similar issues.

Similar to Boykin, Major General Brady is a harsh critic of integrating women into combat units and has been outspoken against the decision to rescind the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy. Brady is a former helicopter pilot who became a legend in Vietnam for his heroics. He is generally recognized as the most-decorated living veteran, and is the author of *Dead Men Flying*, a book that relates true stories of dust-off pilots and aircrew in Vietnam, tracing his personal accounts. According to Brady's website (<http://generalbrady.com>), his personal awards include the following: the Medal of Honor; the Distinguished Service Cross, the nation's second-highest award for valor; six Distinguished Flying Crosses; two Bronze Stars, one for valor; the Purple Heart and 53 Air Medals, one for valor (2014). During Vietnam, Brady flew over "2500 combat missions, evacuating over 5000 wounded" (Brady, 2014).

Brady's position in the debate is made clear in an exclusive feature on *World Net Daily* (WND), discussing his February 2013 article, "Women in Foxholes," where he is quoted stating, "putting females in combat imposes an insane burden on readiness," (as cited in "Most Decorated Living," 2013, p. 1). As with many opponents of integrating women into direct ground combat, Brady, is critical of the Obama administration, Leon Panetta, and many of the senior military and other political officials serving today. In his article, "Women in Foxholes," Brady again makes his opponent stance known, saying "neither Obama nor Panetta have ever served in combat, nor has most of Congress," implying they do not have the personal experience and knowledge to speak credibly on what is or is not good for the military with respect to integrating women into combat (Brady, 2013, p. 1). According to Brady, they can only speculate.

The next member of this opponent stakeholder group, referenced several times in the analytical data set, is retired Army Lieutenant Colonel and former Florida Congressman (Republican), Allen West. During his military career, spanning over two decades in the Army, West served in a variety of infantry roles. He deployed to Kuwait in the early 1990s and served during the Iraq war in 2003. Since leaving the military, West ran on the Republican ticket and was elected to Congress, serving one term in the House of Representatives from 2011 to 2013. Since leaving office, West has worked as a *Fox*

News contributor, providing the platform for him to become an outspoken critic of the decision to rescind the 1994 combat ban on women serving in direct ground combat units.

During a January 2013 broadcast of *Anderson Cooper 360*, following the announcement to remove the 1994 combat exclusion policy, West's opponent position is made clear when he is quoted saying, "with all the budget issues the military is having right now, the focus shouldn't be on this foray into an equality trip" (as cited in Wilstein, 2013p. 1). In the same interview, West refers to professional sports and why women compete in separate leagues from men (as cited in Wilstein, 2013, and Houston, 2013) - a comparison often used throughout the analytical data set by opponents of integrating women into ground combat units.

In another article, "Women in Combat: See Jane Shoot," the author, W.W. Houston, attempts to debunk statements made by West to advance the proponent position. In his article, Houston (2013) quotes West, saying:

GI Jane was a movie and should not be the basis for a policy shift. I know Martha McSally, have known women who are Apache and Cobra pilots, and served with women who were MPs [Military Police], but being on the ground and having to go *mano y mano* in close combat is a completely different environment.

I completely disagree with this decision and can just imagine all the third and fourth order effects and considerations for implementation, such as standards for training. Unless the Obama administration has not noticed we are fighting against a brutal enemy and now is not the time to play social experiment with our ground combat forces. President Obama, as Commander-in-Chief, should be focused on sequestration and the failure of his policies in the Middle East. This is the misconceived liberal progressive vision of fairness and equality which could potentially lead to the demise of our military. (pp. 1–2)

Similar to Boykin and Brady, and to opponent-stakeholders generally, West believes these policy changes are being pushed by feminist groups putting their own agenda ahead of what is best for the military and the men and women who serve the country.

The last military veteran referenced in the data set is retired Army Lieutenant Colonel Robert Maginnis. Maginnis, whose work is previously discussed, was a career

Infantry officer. According to Maginnis' biography on the *Ambassador* website (<http://www.ambassadorspeakers.com>), before retiring in 1993, he served as a "member of the Army's study group examining the homosexual ban" (Maginnis, 2014). Since retirement, Maginnis has become a respected expert on national security and foreign affairs, and has published over 50 articles in professional military journals on ethics, leadership, and personnel matters impacting the military (Maginnis, 2014). Maginnis currently serves as an analyst for Moody Broadcasting Radio Network and makes regular guest appearances to discuss issues surrounding the military, national security, and foreign affairs (Maginnis, 2014). More recently, Maginnis has gained notoriety due to his 2013 book, *Deadly Consequences: How Cowards are Pushing Women into Combat*, where he looks to "set the record straight" on integrating women into direct ground combat units (Maginnis, 2013).

In *Deadly Consequences*, Maginnis describes how putting women into direct ground combat "contradicts science, military history and common sense," and also aims to prove how proponent arguments cannot withstand scrutiny (Maginnis, 2013). Throughout his book, Maginnis summarizes the debate and attempts to debunk all arguments made by proponents of integrating women into ground combat units. It is evident that Maginnis is very critical of President Obama, the President's administration, and senior military leaders of the time, which can make some readers uncomfortable, particularly those who might prefer to evaluate military policy issues on their merit rather than on political ideology. In one example from his book, Maginnis states:

Our armed forces are now led by senior flag and general officers who act more like skilled and obedient politicians than authentic military officers. They have an uncanny sense of which way the political winds are blowing and immediately correct their headings accordingly, while ignoring the consequences for operational readiness, the mission, and the safety and morale of our troops. (Maginnis, 2013, p. 5)

These are harsh words from a former military officer. It is important to note that Maginnis never served in the flag/general officer ranks.

Throughout his book, Maginnis backs up his arguments with information gathered over the past several decades by U.S. government agencies, the military services, and

allied nations on integrating women into ground combat units. To summarize the debate in *Deadly Consequences*, Maginnis (2013) does the following:

- Explains “how America came to consider pushing women into direct ground combat;”
- Examines eight arguments made by proponents for putting women into combat, and shows why they don’t hold up under scrutiny;
- Scrutinizes a number of myths pushed by feminists groups and the media about men, women, and combat to advance their agendas, and proves why they are myths;
- Explains the dangers of sexualizing ground combat units; and
- Concludes by offering a plan of action. (p. 3)

Maginnis goes to great lengths in arguing why integrating women into direct ground combat units would be a bad idea for the military, the men and women who serve, and for America’s national security in the long run. His book garnered support from other prominent stakeholders, including Boykin and West, who provided comments on the back cover.

Table 5 provides a summary of the opponent-stakeholder analysis. The four major groups of stakeholders are shown, along with a brief description of their background and examples of statements or actions that represent their position on the policy change. As seen here, the example statements and rationale of opponent-stakeholders tend to emphasize military readiness or effectiveness, practical problems, innate differences between men and women, and the misguided objectives of those who support the policy change. A number of the example statements differ from those of proponents in that they emphasize political ideology and personal experiences; some argue *ad hominem*, reflecting the nature of political debate.

Table 5. Opponent Stakeholders (Groups and Individuals) of Integrating Women into Direct Ground Combat Units

Stakeholder	Definition / Background of Stakeholder	Example Statements
Center for Military Readiness (CMR) -director is Elaine Donnelly	- The Center for Military Readiness is an independent, non-partisan, public policy organization with a unique mission. CMR promotes high standards and sound priorities in the making of military personnel policies, and takes the lead in defending elements of military culture that are essential for morale and readiness in the All-Volunteer Force (CMR Mission Statement).	- revised warrior training programs sound impressive, but gender-normed standards emasculate the concept by assuring success for average female trainees - feminists have unrealistic theories that land combat is just another career opportunity - about pushing political agendas that do not have the best interest of national security in mind
Female Service Members and Veterans -the two noted most throughout the data points is  (1) Capt Katie Petronio and  (2) Jude Eden	- These are women who have experienced the harshness and brutality of combat. They speak from personal experiences of serving alongside men in Iraq and Afghanistan. - Capt Katie Petronio is a Marine and veteran of Iraq and Afghanistan where she served as a Combat Engineer. She authored the article "Get Over It! We are not all Created Equal," which was published in the Marine Corps Gazette in 2012. Her article is referenced numerous times within the data set of this thesis. - Jude Eden is a former Marine and Iraq War veteran. She has written several articles that included a four part series titled "The Problem(s) of Women in Combat."	- "Get Over it! We are not all created equal" (Captain Petronio, 2012). - "I am not personally hearing female Marines, enlisted or Officer, pounding on the doors of Congress claiming that their inability to serve in the infantry violates their right to equality" (Capt Petronio, 2012). - Lets embrace our differences to hone in on the Corps' success instead of dismantling who we are to achieve political agendas" (Capt Petronio, 2012) - "Men and women are different, but those pushing women into combat don't want to admit the truth" (Eden, 2013). - "The top priority should be military readiness and WINNING wars, not political correctness and artificially imposed equality on the military" (Eden, 2013).
Retired Military Officers (Males): - the four that were most prevalent in the data set were  (1) MG (Ret), Patrick Brady;  (2) LTG (Ret) Boykin;  (3) LTC (Ret) and former U.S. Congressman, Allen West;  (4) LTC (Ret) and author, Robert Maginnis	These former military officers all appeared most throughout the data set and collectively represent the opponent side of the debate in the data. - General Brady is a Medal of Honor recipient and considered to be the most decorated U.S. veteran alive today. - General Boykin is served his career in Army Special Forces and is an original member of the elite Delta Force unit, where he spent the majority of his career in different capacities. He served as the Commander of Army Special Operations and is a former Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence. He is now the Executive Vice President of the Family Research Council, whose mission is to advance faith, family and freedom in public policy and the culture from a Christian worldview (Family Research Council). - LTC West spent over two decades in the Army serving in a variety of Infantry roles. He deployed to Kuwait in the early 1990s and served during the Iraq war in 2003. From 2011-2013 he served one term in Congress in the House of Representatives, and is now a Fox News contributor. Allen West is a member of the Republican Party. - Robert Maginnis is a retired Army Officer and is currently working as a senior military strategist (a contracted position) at the pentagon. Most notably, he authored the 2013 book, <u>Deadly Consequences: How Cowards are Pushing Women into Combat</u> .	- "Women pose an insane burden on readiness...God designed them to produce life and nature it, not destroy it" (Brady, 2013). - Women ineffective in the field because for many reasons to include feminine hygiene issues, pregnancy, sexual distractions, fraternization and assault (Brady). - "A female that can run a marathon does not necessarily translate into a female who can drag a man, let's just say an average man of 175 pounds, with all of his combat gear. It is not the average female that will be able to do that. So it's a readiness issues and no one is considering readiness" (Webb & Winborn, 2013 citing General Boykin). - General Boykin supports women in combat...they already are and have been since 9/11. However, he is firm believer that they should not be in direct ground combat units (infantry, artillery, special forces). - Following the January 24, 2013, announcement by Panetta, West was quoted on <i>Anderson Cooper 360</i> saying "with all the budget issues the military is having right now, the focus shouldn't be on this foray into an equality trip" (Wilstein, 2013 citing comments by Allen West). - West goes on to draw comparisons to professional sports and why women compete in separate leagues than men - a comparison often used throughout the data set by opponents of integrating women into ground combat units. - Maginnis comments with respect to the decision to rescind the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy, "violates a virtually universal principle of military practice...represents military leadership's surrender to political forces of radical feminism...the implications for U.S. national security are sobering" (Maginnis, 2013, inside cover). - Maginnis' book summarizes in detail why the military should NOT integrate women into direct ground combat units and debunks all arguments made by proponents of integration. Many times in his book, he is very critical of the President, the current administration, and senior military leadership—to the point of attacking, which can come across a turn off to someone on the fence about picking a stance on the debate.

## **C. ANALYSIS OF FRAMES**

This portion of the analysis focuses more closely on the two primary frames identified in the data set that are used by the proponent and opponent stakeholders. By analyzing the proponents' use of the "fairness" frame and the opponents' use of the "effectiveness" frame, a deeper understanding is gained of the problems and arguments presented by each stakeholder group in the data set. To support the stakeholder views and claims on integrating women into direct ground combat units, the analysis seeks to identify the underlying assumptions and values that form the basis for arguments presented by stakeholders. These assumptions and values are further explained in the Chapter V, which presents findings. The section begins by explaining the analysis from the proponent side of the debate, which is followed by analysis of the opponent side of the debate.

### **1. Proponent Frame Analysis**

Proponents' arguments and general position in the debate around the integration of women into direct ground combat units can be summarized under a fairness frame. Overall, proponents' arguments in the debate, as played out in the data set collected for this research, boil down to an issue of fairness in some form or another. Because fairness is the issue at hand from the proponents' point of view, two main problems exist due to the combat exclusion policies that have prevented women from serving in direct ground combat units. The first problem deals with discrimination and is based on the policy itself. Proponents believe that policies excluding women from serving because of their gender are discriminatory in nature, and such policies can ultimately hinder or otherwise harm the career opportunities of military women. Discrimination based on sex categorizes men and women by forcing a lower status upon service women. This categorization is what proponents say causes women to not be treated as equals, and to be classified as second-class citizens within the military. Furthermore, supporters of integrating women into direct ground combat units argue that exclusionary policies based on gender promote an environment that allows sexual harassment and assault to thrive (SWAN, 2013).

A second problem presented by proponent-stakeholders is that exclusionary policies limit and prevent the military from making the best use of all personnel by not harnessing the talents and contributions that could be made by female service members. Proponents argue that the 1994 Exclusion Policy did not reflect reality because women are already fighting and dying in combat, often mentioning how over 800 women have been wounded and over 150 have been killed during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (SWAN, 2013). The reality is that women are serving day-in and day-out in non-traditional roles, which are not aligned with the former policy. Hence, the decision to rescind the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy forces DOD policy to catch up to the reality on the ground today. This puts the question of fairness into play, as proponents argue that women do not receive the credit they deserve for their combat service since they (women) have been attached, but not assigned, to combat units on the ground in the wars of the past decade.

Proponent stakeholders argue that women are discriminated against in the military because policies such as the former 1994 Exclusion Policy prevented women from being assigned to direct ground combat units below the brigade level (Burrelli, 2013). Taking it one step further, proponent stakeholders argue that this discrimination has categorized female service members as second-class citizens in the military (Miller and Rosenthal, 2012). They are prevented from serving in jobs that are generally associated with officers who make it to the flag/general officer ranks, thus enforcing what proponents call a “brass ceiling” (Miller and Rosenthal, 2012).

When describing their arguments to support integrating women into direct ground combat units, proponent-stakeholders look to draw comparison with other hard-fought social changes and agendas in the military, specifically acceptance of African Americans into the military and the rescinding the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, enabling homosexuals to serve openly in the military. Furthermore, SWAN suggests that the combat exclusion policy “legalized sex discrimination and helped foster a hostile work environment in which sexual harassment and assault have been allowed to thrive” (SWAN, 2013, p. 1). Another argument supporting this position claims that further integration and removal of exclusions preventing women from serving in direct ground

combat units would level the playing field, thereby becoming a potential remedy for the current epidemic of sexual harassment and assault, facing military women at all ranks. This was made clear in a statement by the CJCS, General Dempsey, in a press conference following the announcement to rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy:

We've had this ongoing issue with sexual harassment, sexual assault. I believe it's because we've had separate classes of military personnel, at some level....when you have one part of the population that is designated as warriors and another part that is designated as something else, I think that disparity begins to establish a psychology that in some cases led to that environment. I have to believe, the more we can treat people equally, the more they are likely to treat each other equally. (as cited in "DOD Memos," 2013)

The key point here for proponent-stakeholders is captured in Dempsey's comment that people are more likely to treat each other equally if the organizational environment does the same. Accordingly, the net result is a reduction in the sexual harassment and assault problems that are currently plaguing the military. Throughout the data set, this interpretation of Dempsey's statement (above) is accepted by both sides of the debate.

Proponent-stakeholders argue that there is more to being effective in direct ground combat than just brute force or physical strength. They argue women (a physiological assumption) are better communicators and are naturally more empathetic than men. Numerous proponent-stakeholders mention how women have been known to often be better shooters and also have less discipline problems than their male counterparts. Proponents of integration argue that the ability to critically think under pressure is another attribute women have shown in combat. All of these arguments are made by proponent stakeholders to convince military leaders, policy makers, and the American public, that having women in direct ground combat units would enhance the overall effectiveness of these units.

Table 6 summarizes the "fairness" frame used by proponents of lifting the combat exclusion provision. As seen here, the frame rests on three underlying assumptions and values: social justice; political representation of citizens' values; improved military

performance, with a more well-rounded force that utilizes all members' abilities most effectively; and the physiological, and underutilized, abilities of women.

Table 6. Proponents "Fairness" Frame

Proponent side: "Fairness" Frame		
Problem	Underlying Assumptions and Values	Arguments (Descriptions and examples)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exclusionary Policies towards women are not fair...are discriminatory, career limiting, categorize women as second class citizens not equal to male counter parts.</li> <li>- Policy must be changed for service women to be treated as equals; ensure equal opportunity, mutually respected.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Social Justice:</b> Society believes in social justice and value equality and equal opportunity. No room for discrimination (gender, race, religion, etc.) in a society of free citizens. Everyone should have the same opportunities</p> <p><b>Political:</b> Country run by political leaders who are elected to represent American citizens. Elected officials direct military to serve the nation's interest. Military represent the ideals and values held by the citizens. Policy should reflect views of society.</p> <p><b>Effectiveness:</b> A well-rounded military is a more effective military. Greater diversity captures a greater base of skill sets and capabilities - strengthens the military overall. Brute strength not the only measurement for effectiveness. The most qualified individual should get the job.</p> <p><b>Physiological:</b> Women are genetically more empathetic than men.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Women are discriminated against because of gender.</li> <li>- Gender-equality and equal opportunity are valued.</li> <li>- Women treated as second-class citizens in military. This environment promotes discrimination and a culture of sexual harassment and assault.</li> <li>- Debate is similar to debate about race and homosexuals in the military, both of which have not proven to be negative for the Services after acceptance.</li> <li>- Unfair to not further integrate women because men can't stop sexually assaulting women.</li> <li>- Women already serving in harm's way. Already in combat serving alongside men.</li> <li>- Women don't receive credit they deserve for serving in combat.</li> <li>- Role of military is to represent the country's citizens. Make political will a reality.</li> <li>- Society values equality and equal opportunity.</li> <li>- Standards should be based on performance and reflect what is needed to perform a job.</li> <li>- Lack in physical strength can be made up more with other strengths (critical thinking, leadership, etc.)</li> <li>- A more well-rounded and diverse military equals a stronger and more effective military.</li> <li>- Women effectively made transition into combat aircraft.</li> <li>- Women shown ability to be better shooters and have less disciplinary issues.</li> <li>- Women able to better gain certain types of intelligence based on local populace and local customs.</li> </ul>

Overall, the proponent stance is focused on solving problems of fairness in the military based on arguments presented in the data set. Proponents believe exclusion policies on women are discriminatory in nature, and prevent women from having the same opportunities for career progression. Proponents assert the military should be a reflection of the population it serves. Any barriers to women in the military promote an environment where sexual harassment and assault can thrive. In the proponent stance, all roads lead back to how the debate is framed around fairness.

## 2. Opponent Frame Analysis

Opponent-stakeholders in the analytical data set frame the debate around military effectiveness. The opponents' position tends to center on two perceived problems. The first is that integrating women into direct ground combat units would reduce the strength and effectiveness of these units because of the physical and physiological differences between men and women. Opponent-stakeholders base their arguments on the results of studies conducted over the past 30 years, including research regarding the vast differences in the physical capabilities of men and women. Unlike proponent-stakeholders, who tend to base their arguments largely around social norms, values, and fairness principles, opponent-stakeholders tend to stress that integrating these units would adversely affect readiness, cohesion, and morale, making direct ground combat units less effective. In this sense, a major difference between opponents and proponents of change appears to be that the former stress practical issues, while the latter emphasize more abstract principles, such as fairness, equal opportunity, and the like. However, both sides, even at the extreme, rely on practical necessities and ideology to drive their positions. That is, for example, ideology and political beliefs clearly influence opponents, while proponents refer to the practical benefits of gender integration.

The second problem emphasized in opponents' arguments focuses on the increased risks to women and men alike. Opponents assert that allowing women to integrate would lead to gender-normed standards, which they claim has historically translated into a lowering of standards. Opponents argue that the high standards for entry into direct ground combat units have been combat-tested and proven over time. Opponent-stakeholders also believe it would be unfair to allow women to serve in an area where they are at a disadvantage and have a reduced chance of survival against a stronger male combatant. Furthermore, opponents assert that it would be unfair to those who currently serve in these units if they were forced to serve with men and women who meet a reduced, gender-normed standard. The following sections discuss the most common arguments presented by opponent-stakeholders in the analytical data set, and how they fall under the "effectiveness" frame.

As noted previously, opponent-stakeholders argue that the debate should be focused on effectiveness, putting the needs of the military before any group or individual. Opponents view policies such as the 1994 Exclusion Policy as not being discriminatory *per se*—the intent is not to hurt the careers of service women or for them to be categorized as second-class citizens—instead, they see the exclusion policy as a means to protect and maintain the most capable fighting force possible for the United States. Female service members are valued by opponent-stakeholders who recognize the efforts and many sacrifices women have made in the military. Nevertheless, opponent-stakeholders argue that women have a reduced chance of survival, on average, when facing male combatants in ground combat due to natural differences between men and women.

Opponent-stakeholders also argue how the push to allow women into direct ground combat units does not seem to be coming largely from within the ranks of the military, but, instead, from outside organizations intent on expanding women's rights and social change in American society. As Petronio states in her 2012 article, "Get over It! We Are Not All Created Equal," "I am not personally hearing female Marines, enlisted or officer, pounding on the doors of Congress claiming that their inability to serve in the infantry violates their right to equality" (p. 2). This sentiment is shared by Eden, who wrote in one of her articles, "those pushing women into combat" don't want to admit the truth—men and women are different, and that is why men and women have different standards in the military (Eden, 2013, p. 1). Opponent-stakeholder arguments are centered around effectiveness, focusing on what is best for the military and for the service men and women filling the ranks. This is fundamentally different from the proponent stance, which is focused largely on promoting women's rights and social reform throughout the nation, including the military, in the name of fairness.

Another argument presented by opponent-stakeholders is that combat effectiveness would be reduced by integrating women into direct ground combat units because of the differences in physical capabilities of men and women. Several studies conducted by the British military in the early 1990s found that women had "tremendous increases in injury rates" when forced to train under "gender-free physical standards"

(Maginnis, 2013, p. 124). These studies found that the number of shin bone fractures in military women rose from “12.6 to 231.2 per ten-thousand personnel, and stress fractures of the feet increased substantially as well” (Maginnis, 2013, p. 124). In 2002, the results of these studies were published in the *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, in an article by Ian Gemmell, titled, noting how the information “confirms and quantifies the excess risk for women when they undertake the same arduous training as male recruits, and highlights the conflict between health and safety legislation and equal opportunities legislation” (Maginnis, 2013, p. 125, quoting Gemmell, 2002).

Another study from the 1990s was conducted by the Department of Orthopedics at the U.S. Naval Academy from 1991 to 1997, evaluating the “risks of anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury for female midshipmen” (Maginnis, 2013, p. 124). This study of ACL injury rates found that “the risk of an ACL injury while participating in sports was three-times higher for women than men” and that, in military training, which is very athletic, females were [nine times] as likely to experience an ACL injury (Maginnis, 2013, p. 124).

Many arguments presented by opponent-stakeholders in the debate regularly refer to statistics showing the differences between men and women and point to the many different physical standards the services already have in place, such as the Marine Corps Physical Fitness Test (PFT). As pointed out by Elaine Donnelly in her statement before the House Armed Services Committee (HASC), July 2013, Hearing on Women in Service Review: “A male Marine must run 18 minutes or faster to achieve the maximum score on the 3-mile run; a female Marine must run 21 minutes or faster to achieve the maximum score on the 3-mile run” (Donnelley, 2013, p. 7). Another example highlighting the difference in physical capabilities between men and women is captured in an article on *Creators.com*, titled “Women in Combat,” by Walter Williams, a professor of economics at George Mason University. In his article, Williams (2013) provides statistics from the USMC Women in Service Restrictions Review and from a study conducted over two decades by William Gregor, a professor of social sciences at the Army’s Command and General Staff College. In his article, Williams writes:

The Army's physical fitness test in basic training is a three-event physical performance test used to assess endurance. The minimum requirement for 17- to 21-year-old males is 35 pushups, 47 sit-ups and a two-mile run in 16 minutes, 36 seconds or less. For females of the same age, the minimum requirement is 13 pushups, 47 sit-ups and a 19:42 two-mile run. Why the difference in fitness requirements? "USMC Women in the Service Restrictions Review" found that women, on average, have 20 percent lower aerobic power, 40 percent lower muscle strength, 47 percent less lifting strength and 26 percent slower marching speed than men.

William Gregor, professor of social sciences at the Army's Command and General Staff College, reports that in tests of aerobic capacity, the records show, only 74 of 8,385 Reserve Officers' Training Corps women attained the level of the lowest 16 percent of men. The "fight load" — the gear an infantryman carries on patrol — is 35 percent of the average man's body weight but 50 percent of the average Army woman's weight. In his examination of physical fitness test results from the ROTC, dating back to 1992, and 74,000 records of male and female commissioned officers, only 2.9 percent of women were able to attain the men's average pushup ability and time in the two-mile run. (Williams, 2013, p. 1)

Opponent-stakeholders often base their arguments on statistics such as these, and from many other studies showing the same. Opponents tend to emphasize what they feel is best for the military as a whole. Their focus is on maintaining a broader definition of effectiveness and the most capable fighting force, often influenced by personal experience. Generally, opponent-stakeholders can be resistant to change, particularly if the change involves a perception of risk or movement into otherwise uncharted territory.

Additionally, opponents' arguments often center on how they distinguish between the experiences of those serving in combat support roles and those serving in direct ground combat units. Opponent-stakeholders acknowledge that all service men and women who are deployed in a war zone serve in harm's way; but, they also understand there is a fundamental difference in the experiences of support personnel, who may experience incident-related combat, compared with the combat experienced day-in and day-out by direct ground combatants. Opponent-stakeholders thus argue that the two roles, combat support and combat-centric, are very different. In 1994, when Secretary of Defense Les Aspin implemented the DOD Assignment Policy (i.e., exclusion policy), the following definition was used to describe ground combat:

**Definition.** Direct ground combat is engaging the enemy on the ground with individual or crew served weapons, while being exposed to hostile fire and to a high probability of direct physical contact with the hostile forces personnel. Direct ground combat takes place well forward on the battlefield, while locating and closing with the enemy to defeat them by fire, maneuver, or shock effect. (1994 DOD Assignment Policy as cited in Burrelli, 2013, p. 5)

This definition covers offensive-oriented operations, which are what direct ground combat units do. Their primary function is to “locate and close with the enemy.” This requires a very different mindset than what is required by combat support personnel serving in harm’s way. Combat support personnel may encounter an enemy and experience combat, but that is not their mission. They react to an attack; they aren’t expected to be out looking for a gunfight.

The job of direct ground combatants is considered the most physically demanding in the military and is why the physical standards for entry into these jobs are set so high. Standards are set even higher for elite units such as Special Forces. Opponent-stakeholders believe these high standards are necessary to maintain the effectiveness of the units. They argue that these standards are combat-proven and have been tested and developed over time through many conflicts. Opponent-stakeholders tend to express concern that allowing women to serve in ground combat might lead to a lowering of the standards to accommodate or promote increased participation by women. At the same time, proponent-stakeholders assert strongly that any policy change would maintain established, combat-proven standards; the only change would be removing the prohibition on service by women, who would still be required to meet the same higher standards that equate with effective performance by ground combat units and personnel.

Table 7 displays the “effectiveness” frame presented by opponent-stakeholders. As in Table 6, the underlying assumptions and values are divided into four categories. An important element in the “effectiveness” frame is that change involves risk, and that the status quo has been proven to work successfully. In other words, why change if the benefits of change do not outweigh the risks?

Table 7. Opponent “Effectiveness” Frame

Opponent side: “Effectiveness” Frame		
Problem	Underlying Assumptions and Values	Arguments (Descriptors and examples)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The status quo is proven successful. Military standards are combat proven; tested and developed over time. Decades of data show women not equal to men physically or physiologically.</li> <li>- Change threatens military effectiveness in direct ground combat units. Change will reduce readiness and increases risk to men and women.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Social Justice:</b> Society believes in social justice and value equality and equal opportunity. Gender based policies not intended to discriminate, rather intent is to increase military strength and effectiveness. It would be unjust to put women in a job where they are put at a disadvantage and take on more risk than men.</p> <p><b>Political:</b> Elected officials and other policy/law makers should focus on military strength and winning wars, not on outside social agendas of non-military groups. Role of the military is to protect the nation and execute the will of the United States.</p> <p>- Direct ground combat is different than incident related combat that is experienced by the thousands of men and women serving in combat support roles, all of which serve in harm's way.</p> <p><b>Effectiveness:</b> Military standards are combat proven and have been developed and tested over time. Gender-norming standards, is in fact lowering standards.</p> <p>- Integration reduces effectiveness, decreases morale and cohesion. The most qualified individual should get the job.</p> <p><b>Physical and Physiological:</b> Men and women are different. Men genetically have a greater propensity for violence and have better chance of survival in direct ground combat.</p>	<p>Intent of Exclusion Policies is not to discriminate against women, but rather to protect women.</p> <p>Gender-normed standards really lower standards.</p> <p>Forced integration is discriminatory against men who meet current standard.</p> <p>Current standards are combat-proven and have been tested over time.</p> <p>Gender-neutral / gender-normed standards are not equal and will only lower the current standards</p> <p>Women do already serving in harm's way, and many have served in FETs, a non-traditional role, but necessary in the current theater of war.</p> <p>Direct ground combat units (infantry, armor, Special Forces) experiences are vastly different than the incident related combat experienced by service members in combat-support specialties.</p> <p>Men and women are different.</p> <p>Women not built to be in the infantry, will have drastic rises in injury rates; will reduce unit cohesion and readiness levels.</p> <p>Further integration will not fix the ramped problem of sexual harassment and assault in the military; it will make it worse.</p> <p>Women bare unequal risk as frontline troops because of what they may face if taken captive by a savage enemy.</p> <p>Policy should be focused on what is best for the military as a whole, not for a select group within the military.</p>

## D. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

Both stakeholder groups identified in the data view the debate on integrating women into direct ground combat units through different lenses. The proponent side tends to focus on the fairness frame. For example many proponents argue that the U.S. military should remove policies that are viewed as discriminating by gender. Proponents also compare the discrimination they say service women experience from exclusion policies with the discrimination formerly experienced by African Americans service members prior to military desegregation and by homosexual service members before the

repeal of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, which prevented homosexual service members from serving openly in the military. These are all categorized as “exclusionary policies,” since they create a blanket prohibition on the service of people who fit into a particular group. Proponents tend to base their arguments largely on issues of fairness, whereas opponents concentrate mainly on military effectiveness.

Opponent stakeholders believe proponents of integration discount decades of data depicting the vast differences between men and women, both physically and physiologically. Opponents do not view the prohibition as necessarily discriminatory, but rather as a necessity to protect both female and male service members from the increased risk they would face in integrated ground combat units. Furthermore, opponent-stakeholders distinguish between generally serving in harm’s way and what is experienced by direct ground combatants.

Table 8 summarizes the differences in proponent and opponent views, using five key themes as an organizing framework. The table provides examples of how each side portrays the different themes to support its position, as identified in the analytical data set. It should be emphasized that each side of the debate is far more complicated than addressed here, often with a mixture of positions and perspectives, and each of these presents compelling arguments. The intent of the analysis conducted here is not to determine which side is right or wrong, but rather to better inform the discussion on how each stakeholder group frames the debate through the problems and the arguments examined within the analytical data set. In the next chapter, findings are presented to further explain the underlying assumptions and values held by each stakeholder group and how these assumptions and values are reflected in the major arguments.

Table 8. Primary Themes

Key Theme	Proponent Example	Opponent Example
Women have been in combat	- Women already in combat - over 200 thousand women have deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan; more than 800 women have been wounded and over 150 killed (numerous media sources)	- Women serve in crucial combat support roles (vehicle drivers, gunners, medics, engineers, etc.), but these are not the infantry - whose purpose is to engage and kill the enemy (Hernandez, 2013). - Women have been subjected to contingent, incident-related combat while serving in harm's way. This is vastly different than direct ground combat units such as the infantry and special forces, whose mission is to locate, close with, and attack the enemy in offensive oriented operations (CMR, August & July, 2013).
Supporting (Incident related) vs. Primary Mission Combat (Infantry)	"There's not a big difference at all, in many of the missions we did with the infantry...we were all fighting the same fight, doing the same thing" (Martin, 2013 quoting Halfaker).	Thirty years of studies show women have a do not have equal opportunity to survive in direct ground combat or to help fellow soldiers survive. (Donnelly, January 2013).
Policy catching up to reality	Army 1st Lt, Ashely White, who was killed by an IED in Afghanistan while serving as part of a team attached to a special operations units: Lt White was working with Rangers, breaking the exclusion policy -- for women to do these jobs the Army had to get 'exception to policy memos' (McNeil, 2013)	- If women are acceptable to serving in combat, then should be acceptable whether they volunteer or not (i.e. get assigned) to combat jobs (Mulrine, 2013). - "I haven't met an infantry Marine, from senior leadership to lower levels that has been in agreement with this change" (Brennan, 2013, citing a Marine Staff Sergeant). - Capt Petronio notes in her article that she is not personally hearing or witnessing female service members "pounding on doors of Congress" to get into the Infantry.
Differences in Physical Capabilities of men and women	- Anyone qualified and that meets the standard should get a chance to serve on the frontlines regardless of sex; should be about having the most qualified individual in the job. (SWAN, 2013).	- USMC presented data in 2011 to DACOWITS showing compared to men, women have 20% less aerobic power, 40% less muscle strength, 47% lower lifting capacity, and 26% slower road-march speed (Kirkwood, 2013)
Sexual Issues in Military (Consensual, Harassment and Assault)	- Combat exclusion policy "legalized sex discrimination and helped foster a hostile work environment in which sexual harassment and assault have been allowed to thrive (SWAN, 2013).	- DOD research shows 1 in 3 women has suffered a sexual assault in military, twice the rate of civilian women (Fortin, 2013, citing Owens) - Robert Maginnis, author of <i>Deadly Consequences</i> , argues that the "already serious problems of sexual assault in the military will get worse" Thompson 2013, citing Maginnis).

## **V. FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS**

This chapter begins with the findings of the analysis of online articles discussing the integration of women into direct ground combat positions. This is followed by a discussion of DOD's efforts to integrate women into direct ground combat positions. The chapter concludes with recommendations on how to best implement the new policy, including a potential compromise approach.

### **A. FINDINGS**

The analysis shows proponent and opponent stakeholders groups base their respective arguments for and against integrating women into direct ground combat on underlying assumptions and values. Though the broader classification of these assumptions and values are similar between the groups, the interpretations are distinctly different, as evident in the frames the groups use to support their respective positions (see Table 8). The following sections discuss the assumptions and values underlying each stakeholder group's frames and explain how the assumptions and values provide a foundation for their respective arguments for and against integrating women into direct ground combat units.

#### **1. Proponents' Fairness Framing**

As observed in Chapter IV, proponent-stakeholder's use of the fairness frame is grounded upon underlying assumptions and values identified in the data. These assumptions and values are categorized into four themes: (1) social justice; (2) political justice; (3) effectiveness; and (4) physiological characteristics. Proponents' primary arguments are based upon one or more of these assumptions and values.

Proponents' fairness frame draws upon an underlying assumption of the value of social justice, which is interpreted from this perspective as requiring fairness, which equates to equality. Implicit in proponents' framing is the argument, if one believes in equality, then one believes that all citizens should be treated equally regardless of race, gender, religion, or other characteristics and thus one must agree that men and women

should have equal opportunity, including the opportunity to serve in the U.S. military in essentially equal roles. Drawing upon this underlying assumption that fairness equates to equality and the value that equality is desirable, proponent-stakeholders argue the case that women should be able to serve in direct ground combat units—if one believes men and women share equally the right to serve in the military, and if one believes in equality and a society where all people are treated with dignity, respect, and fairness without prejudice, then one must agree with full gender integration of the military. In this example, the questioning line is based on underlying assumptions that men and women should be treated as equals and social justice is valued.

Though the above paragraph is intended as an illustration, it represents the layers involved in building the proponents' position from the underlying assumptions and values held by the proponent-stakeholders. This example demonstrates how arguments are presented and framed in a context rooted upon the stakeholder group's interpretations of assumptions and values believed to be widely-held by the audience.

The analysis shows that the key social justice arguments can be traced back to the two problems identified as such by proponent-stakeholders through the lens of the fairness frame. The first problem presented by proponent-stakeholders relates to the treatment of women, presenting exclusion policies as unfair because they discriminate against women based on their gender and categorizes women as second-class citizens in the military, unequal to their male counterparts. The second problem presented by proponent-stakeholders deals with the unfairness associated with the lack of credit women receive for the jobs they have been performing for the past decade in combat. Women are serving in combat, alongside their male counterparts. Combat exclusions on women prevent the military from capturing and harnessing the talents of all service members, and the proponents' side argues that it is fair and just that the best-qualified person (man or woman) should get the job.

Many proponent-stakeholder arguments presented in the data set are based on the underlying assumptions and values favoring social justice largely endorsed by individuals in American society. If an individual values social justice and agrees that discrimination

based on gender, race, or religion, is wrong, then that individual should also believe everyone should be treated as equals and should have the same opportunities, including the right to serve in direct ground combat units, regardless of gender, if the standards can be met and if the standards are a true reflection of what it takes to perform the job.

Proponents' fairness frame also draws on an underlying assumption of the value of political justice. From this perspective, policy is seen as an extension of a political agenda supported by democratic leaders, elected by the voting public, to represent the citizenry of the U.S. democratic republic. Proponent stakeholders present their position as one congruent with the values of American society, the voting public, and the elected officials who pass laws and make policy that influences the military.

For example, proponents link further integration and the removal of exclusions preventing women from serving in direct ground combat units to a level playing field, which they suggest may remedy the current epidemic of sexual harassment and assault, at all ranks. For example, General Dempsey stated in a press conference following the announcement to rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy:

We've had this ongoing issue with sexual harassment, sexual assault. I believe it's because we've had separate classes of military personnel, at some level . . . when you have one part of the population that is designated as warriors and another part that is designated as something else, I think that disparity begins to establish a psychology that in some cases led to that environment. I have to believe, the more we can treat people equally, the more they are likely to treat each other equally. (as cited in "DOD Memos," 2013)

This statement implies that, if men and women treat and view each other as equals, the military's sexual harassment and assault problem can be reduced. Throughout the analytical data set, this interpretation of what General Dempsey suggests is accepted by both sides of debate.

Another common argument made by proponent-stakeholders is that women are already serving in combat alongside their male counterparts and have been for over a decade. This argument reflects the assumption of the value of political justice, interpreted as described above, and also an assumption of the value of an effective military, which is

discussed below. Linking to an assumption of the value of political justice, interpreted as the obligation of politicians to evenly carry out the will of the electorate, proponents note that women have made a successful transition to combat aviation since it opened to them in 1994. Proponents point out that previous policy changes expanding women's opportunities have all been supported by the electorate and have been successful in the past.

Proponents further interpret political justice to require that the military reflect the citizenry base for which it serves. If society values political justice, then all Americans should have an equal chance to serve and try out for all jobs in the military. Political justice, as interpreted by proponents, requires that the military represent the values held by the majority of its citizens.

Proponents assume an American value for effectiveness, which they interpret as demonstrated successful performance under fire and often cite examples of female valor. One such example is the story of Leigh Ann Hester, who was awarded the Silver Star, for her actions in defending her unit during an ambush. Another example of effectiveness, as interpreted by proponents, is the use of women in female engagement teams to gather intelligence based on their abilities to better communicate with local women. Proponents point to the success of women in these non-traditional roles to demonstrate how women are successfully serving on the frontline; they were imbedded with the infantry, conducting combat foot patrols at the small-unit, tactical level. Female service members have been volunteering to serve in such capacities, and the Services have found ways around the former policy to implement this unique capability. Proponents thus interpret effectiveness to include diverse skills and capabilities. Furthermore, this interpretation supports arguments that the former policy was incongruent with practice, as women had been serving in roles attached to infantry units below the brigade level.

Overall, the many arguments made by proponents address the two problems identified in the proponents' position within the fairness frame and are founded upon multiple underlying assumptions and values. Proponents make underlying assumptions of the values held by the American public, which they interpret under a broader fairness

frame to link the problems they identify to the solution presented by integrating women fully into ground combat arms. Proponents seek to gain the support of society and political leaders who are responsible for representing the voting public and for implementing policy and changing laws. They frame the debate around fairness, because the assumptions made and values held by proponent-stakeholders support this frame, and fairness appeals to the public-at-large. Overall, proponent-stakeholders frame the debate around fairness in a context pushing for social change and equality in the United States. This puts pressure on policy makers and senior military officials to make changes based on what is valued by American society.

## **2. Opponents' Effectiveness Framing**

Opponents draw on categories of assumptions and values similar to those of proponents. Opponents' arguments draw upon assumptions of Americans' values regarding social justice, political justice, effectiveness, and physical and physiological characteristics. Opponents' interpretations of these values, however, as well as the specific problems they identify, differ from those of proponents. Opponents interpret and emphasize the need for effectiveness, which they equate with existing standards and physical strength.

The first problem that opponents identify is that integrating women into direct ground combat units would reduce the strength and effectiveness of these units because of the physical and physiological differences of men and women. Opponents believe integration would adversely affect readiness, cohesion, and morale, making direct ground combat units less effective. The second problem opponents identify is that opening these units to women would increase the risk to the men in these units and to the women who integrate. Opponents argue that it is unfair to allow women to serve in positions in which they would have a reduced chance of survival. Furthermore, opponents assert that it is unfair to those who currently serve in these units to be forced to serve with men and women who might meet a reduced, gender-normed standard.

Drawing on the underlying assumption that military effectiveness is paramount, and an interpretation that equates military effectiveness with greater power and strength,

then women should not serve in combat positions. This argument could be equated to putting females on the offensive line of an NFL football team. If one agrees that the purpose of the team is to win the game, and that effective play is based on physical strength, one would have to agree that, with an equally-qualified woman on the offensive line, the team would have a better chance of winning, or a better chance to prevent a sack of the quarterback. And if that hypothetical team with qualified women on its front line would not be more likely to win, then women should not be included. Subsequently, if ground combat effectiveness is based on greater strength, and women, on average, are not as strong, as fast, or as aerobically fit as men (on average), then integrating women into direct ground combat units would reduce the capabilities of the unit, which would be counter to effectiveness. An important point here is that these hypothetical examples are based on the average abilities of men and women; obviously, as opponent-stakeholders note, many men are not as physically capable as their female counterparts, just as many men and women alike would be unable to meet the standards of physical strength assumed to correlate with success in combat.

Opponents make similar arguments related to sexual assault. That is, opponents argue that, when the Navy integrated women onto ships, and over time, as new roles opened for women, the military has become more gender-integrated, and the numbers of sexual harassment and assault cases have been on the rise. Thus, integrating women into the most male-dominated fighting units is unlikely to reduce the number of sexual assaults but, rather, would likely make the situation worse. These arguments demonstrate how opponents frame the debate under the umbrella of effectiveness. The following sections explain how opponents' arguments presented through an effectiveness frame are linked to their interpretations of assumed, widely-held American values.

Opponents of integrating women into direct ground combat units draw upon an American value for social justice, as do proponents in making their argument; however, opponents interpret social justice differently. Opponents argue that it would not be socially just to allow women to serve in direct ground combat units because, on average, they would have a reduced chance of survival against male enemy combatants and would

shoulder an excessive burden of extra risk. This risk is not only associated with women having a reduced chance of survival due to the physical and physiological differences between men and women, but their potential exposure to sexual torture, if taken captive. Throughout history, many adversaries have shown a disregard for treating male prisoners with dignity. Opponents argue that women, especially, would face the risk of rape and other types of sexual mistreatment, especially in parts of the world where men dominate society and women are not valued. Opponents argue that women would face a greater risk of such mistreatment in direct ground combat, and exposing them to such risk is another unfair burden.

Additionally, opponents view policies such as the 1994 Exclusion Policy as not being discriminatory in nature—the intent is to not hurt the careers of service women or for them to be categorized as second-class citizens—instead they are a means to protect and maintain the most capable fighting force possible for the United States. Female service members are valued by opponents and they acknowledge the service and many sacrifices women have made, especially over the past decade in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Similar to proponents, opponents assume Americans value political justice. However, opponents interpret political justice to require that the military, above all, protect the nation and execute the will of the United States. Elected officials and other policy and law makers should thus focus on military strength and winning wars, not on any non-military social agenda or policy changes that are risky at best. Furthermore, opponents argue that direct ground combat is different than incident-related combat that is experienced by thousands of men and women serving in combat support roles, all of whom serve in harm's way. Opponents note that approximately 80 percent of military jobs involve supporting direct ground combat troops. This means that the majority of male service members are not direct ground combatants.

Opponent-stakeholders argue that, rather than representing the majority of the American public, those behind the push to integrate women into direct ground combat are outside feminist organizations that have put their own social and political agenda ahead of what is best for the military and the men and women who serve this country. As a

result, men and women in uniform will suffer the consequences caused by integrating women into direct ground combat units. Captain Petronio, for example, as noted previously in Chapter IV, makes this point in her article, “Get Over It! We Are Not All Created Equal,” where she suggests it is not female Marines driving this policy change or even Congress, but rather it is being driven by outside organizations, such as DACOWITS, that are leading the fight to expand women’s rights and opportunities in the military (Petronio, 2012).

Furthermore, opponents note that most civilians, voters, even political leaders, have never served in the military or experienced direct ground combat, arguing that they make policy changes without any real knowledge or first-hand experience. They assert that the military should not be used to push a social agenda and reform. Rather, laws and policies affecting the military should be focused on what is best for the military with respect to maintaining war-fighting effectiveness and capabilities. The goal should be to maintain the world’s supreme fighting force, and not allow potential enemies to close the military gap the United States has established in the modern era.

Another argument made by opponent stakeholders related to political justice is that integrating women into direct ground combat units would not fix the ongoing problem the military faces with respect to sexual harassment and assault. Opponents argue that further integration, especially into the most male-dominated jobs in the military, would only add to the growing problem of sexual harassment and assault. Opponents argue that this is a problem that needs to be corrected through better leadership, at all levels in the military. Opponents also argue that the military, as a whole, needs to do a better job of holding service members accountable for their actions when convicted on sexual harassment or assault charges.

Opponents make a clear distinction between combat experienced by support personnel serving in harm’s way and the combat experienced day-in and day-out by direct ground combatants. All opponent-stakeholders identified in the analytical data set, interpret direct ground combat as involving substantially more risk and requiring a different mindset than combat support. Opponents define ground combat as follows:

Direct ground combat is engaging the enemy on the ground with individual or crew served weapons, while being exposed to hostile fire and to a high probability of direct physical contact with the hostile forces personnel. Direct ground combat takes place well forward on the battlefield, while locating and closing with the enemy to defeat them by fire, maneuver, or shock effect. (1994 DOD Assignment Policy as cited in Burrelli, 2013, p. 5)

This definition emphasizes offensive-oriented operations, where direct ground combatants actively look to seek out and destroy the enemy. These operations are fundamentally different from those of combat support personnel, who on occasion may need to take action in self-defense if attacked, but do not actively seek combat. The mission of direct ground combatants is heavily physical, and, thus, the physical standards for entry into the infantry, Special Forces, and other direct ground combat jobs are the highest in the military.

Furthermore, opponents note that the nature of the battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan are very different from those of wars past. Service men and women today serve in a counter- insurgency (COIN) environment, where the enemy does not wear uniforms and easily blends into the local population. In the COIN environment, the frontlines are blurred and troops are more vulnerable to attack. Opponent stakeholders argue that future wars may not involve COIN operations and therefore the military must retain a focus on traditional wars, where the opposition is a country and not a radical group such as al-Qa'ida or the Taliban. Opponents thus distinguish between direct ground combat as defined in policy and the incident-related combat experienced by combat support personnel while deployed in harm's way.

Opponent stakeholders argue that women face a reduced chance of survival in direct ground combat because of their genetic predisposition, both physically and physiologically, when compared with that of men. These differences are hard to overcome on the battlefield when engaged in close-quarter, hand-to-hand, direct ground combat. The genetic predisposition of men and women simply means that men and women are not created equally and thus some jobs are more suited to men than women and to women than men.

Opponents believe, if women are integrated into direct ground combat units, as a group, women would experience a disproportionate increase in the numbers of non-combat related injuries, often to their backs and lower extremities. Opponents argue that injuries such as spinal decompression and stress fractures are due to innate differences between the male and female bodies that make women, on average, less suitable for the direct ground combat mission. This is based on opponent interpretations of results from decades of studies researching the subject, conducted by both the U.S. military and allied partners around the globe. Opponents also believe that men, due to higher testosterone levels, naturally have a greater propensity for violence than do women. Opponents argue that women naturally lack the physical characteristics to survive, on average, and integrating them into direct ground combat would be unfair to them as well as to the men who would be forced to serve alongside women.

Table 9 summarizes and compares the frames of proponents and opponents based on the following six categories, as discussed above: Social Justice; Political Justice; Effectiveness; Physiological; and Physical (for opponent-stakeholders only). As seen here, collectively, opponent-stakeholders present their arguments to address the problems they associate with integrating women into combat under the effectiveness frame. The foundation of these arguments is the underlying assumptions of the values held by the American people, as interpreted by opponents. All themes in arguments of the opponent position link to effectiveness. Opponents argue that the needs of the military should come before the needs of any individual or group. The military should focus on winning wars and not on conforming to “feminist ideology and social reform agendas” based on claims of gender discrimination. Opponents acknowledge that all service members serve in harm’s way, but draw a distinction between the experiences of those serving in combat support roles and those serving as direct ground combatants. Opponents believe that effectiveness should take precedence over other values, but also interpret social justice such that women should not be subjected to unfair risk.

Table 9. Proponent and Opponent Frames, Assumptions and Values

Categories	Proponent - Fairness Frame	Opponent – Effectiveness Frame
Social Justice	Americans support social justice and value equality and equal opportunity. There is no place for discrimination (gender, race, religion, etc.) in a society of free citizens. Everyone should have the same opportunities	Americans support social justice and value equality and equal opportunity. Gender based policies are not intended to discriminate; rather the intent is to increase military strength and effectiveness. It would be unjust to put women in a job in which they are at a disadvantage and must therefore bear greater risk than men.
Political Justice	The U.S. is a country run by political leaders who are elected to represent American citizens. Elected officials direct military to serve the nation's interest. Military represent the ideals and values held by the citizens. Policy should reflect views of society.	The role of the military is to protect the nation and execute the will of the United States. Elected officials and other policy/law makers should focus on military strength and winning wars, not on outside social agendas of non-military groups. Direct ground combat is different than incident related combat that is experienced by the thousands of men and women serving in combat support roles, all of which serve in harm's way.
Effectiveness	A well-rounded military is a more effective military. Greater diversity captures a greater base of skill sets and capabilities and thus, strengthens the military overall. Physical strength is not the only measurement of effectiveness. The most qualified individual, based on diverse skill sets and capabilities should get the job.	-Military standards are combat-proven and have been developed and tested over time. Gender-norming, is, in fact, lowering standards. -Integration reduces effectiveness and decreases morale and cohesion. The most qualified individual should get the job.
Physiological	Women are genetically more empathetic than men and thus better able to succeed at certain tasks.	Men have higher testosterone level and a greater propensity for violence.
Physical (Opponent)		Men and women are different. Men physically have more capabilities that are better suited for sustained combat.

## B. IMPLICATIONS TO DOD

Throughout the course of this research, it has been assumed that the U.S. military will continue working toward integrating women into direct ground combat units. Full integration may not occur by January 2016, as directed, because the Services are permitted to request waivers for integration if they can prove it is in the best interests of the military. This research thus assumes that integration of women into direct ground combat units is inevitable, whether by 2016 or a later date. This section discusses the implications of DOD's effort to integrate women into ground combat, as suggested by the present analysis of the debate.

The first implication suggested by analyzing this debate is that costs may be associated with implementing integration plans resulting from the need to gain support of diverse stakeholders. Costs to resolve the debate sufficiently to support implementation include the time spent by military personnel studying how to best go about executing

integration plans, the extra facilities that would need to be built or remodeled to support a greater female presence in direct ground combat units below the brigade level, and the added cost of potential medical expenses for women who are injured during training. Managing cost expectations is even more important now, considering the fiscal state of the nation and the ever-increasing budget cuts facing the military services and DOD as a whole. The service men and women in uniform today are already asked to do more, with less, and this is a trend likely to continue for years to come.

Maintaining current standards is one of the more contested areas in this debate between proponents and opponents of the policy change. If the policy is to be implemented, then the standards will need to be viewed as legitimate by both sides. In developing standards, policy must clearly state what the standard is, and not leave room for interpretation. The standards must not be based on exerted effort; that is, a woman who can do X number of pull-ups or run a given distance in X minutes exerts the same effort as a man who does Y number of pull-ups and runs the same distance in Y minutes. Rather, the standards should be the same, and if men and women meet that same standard, then they should be allowed to enter a given field. If this results in only a few women being able to meet the standard required for assignment to ground combat, then DOD must accept that could result in a large financial cost for the potential benefit of a few individuals. DOD would need to determine if current standards are a true measure of what is needed to meet the mission.

Another implication is that integrating women into direct ground combat units could cause female service members to become more alienated, especially if standards are somehow different between men and women or if related policies are created to develop an initial critical mass of women in direct ground combat units as part of an implementation plan. DOD would have to educate and convince other service members that integration is good for the military, because there is a chance it could cause resentment. Resentment has the potential to add to the already growing problems of sexual harassment and assault plaguing the military today.

### **C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DOD**

The following recommendations are offered as a means to assist DOD in developing implementation plans to integrate women into direct ground combat units. The recommendations begin with military policy. Past policies have left room for interpretation by military commanders. Future policy must be stated clearly with respect to how personnel are assigned. The former Exclusion Policy states that women were not to be assigned to direct ground combat units below the brigade level, with no mention of attaching. Thus, ground commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan were able to attach women into specific, non-traditional roles to meet their real-time needs. This lack of clarity provided a means for the military to work around the stated policy, and it has contributed to the argument by proponents that current policies need to catch up with reality.

Next, DOD must determine if there is a difference in incident-related combat, while serving in harm's way, from that experienced by direct ground combatants on the frontlines day-in and day-out. If there is a difference, future DOD policy must define (or redefine) direct ground combat and should delineate more clearly what is considered direct ground combat and what is called incident-related combat in the debate. It does not make sense to draw comparisons to the experiences of combat support personnel serving in harm's way, who may occasionally come under fire or hit a road-side bomb, to the day-to-day combat experienced by direct ground combatants. The service members who are currently fighting on the frontlines in Afghanistan, and all of those who have fought on the frontlines in past wars, have shouldered a much larger burden than the rest of those in the military.

It should come as no surprise that a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is recommended. As the DOD faces current and future budget cuts, it must determine if integrating women is worth the additional cost. The CBA must account for all forms of costs, from lost work-days, to the cost of women who might become non-deployable or are redeployed,

to the cost of conducting studies evaluating physical standards, to the cost of writing policy. DOD must be accountable for justifying the money spent to integrate women into direct ground combat units.

Another recommendation is for DOD to survey all active duty and reserve military personnel regarding plans to integrate women into direct ground combat. However, unlike smaller surveys in the past, the really hard questions must be asked. For example, service men and women should be asked if they feel integrating women into direct ground combat units is good for the military? Would integrating women into direct ground combat units reduce or enhance effectiveness? For women—would you ever consider being assigned to a direct ground combat unit? For men—would you ever consider being assigned to a gender-integrated direct ground combat unit? Asking the hard questions would allow for the best, uncompromised feedback from the men and women currently filling the ranks.

Last, in an attempt to reach compromise between proponents and opponents, DOD should establish permanent secondary military occupational specialties (MOSs) for non-traditional roles that have become commonplace in the wars of the past decade to maintain the resident knowledge gained from women who have served in these roles, such as the Lioness program or those on female engagement teams. Future wars may not involve COIN operations, and the enemy may not blend into the local populace, as seen in Iraq and Afghanistan. The frontlines in future wars may be more clearly delineated and the enemy may be uniformed troops. In that environment, the need for FETs may not exist, as it does today, and studies suggest that women serving on the frontlines of a more traditional war could face an unfair risk and reduced chance of survival. By offering a secondary MOS, female service members who can meet a standard (which would need to be developed) could be trained to have this secondary MOS, allowing the U.S. military to have a unique capability, if the environment in future conflicts causes a need for it.

#### **D. SUMMARY**

In this chapter, findings are presented describing how proponents and opponents of the policy change frame their arguments around fairness and effectiveness, respectively, based on underlying assumptions and values held by each stakeholder group. Selected implications of integrating women into direct ground combat units are presented, followed by recommendations. The next chapter concludes this thesis and offers recommendations for future research regarding the debate over integrating women into direct ground combat.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

### A. SUMMARY

The decision to rescind the 1994 Combat Exclusion Policy and integrate women into direct ground combat units was a groundbreaking moment for proponents of gender integration, who had long fought to remove all barriers to women's service in the military. The debate on integrating women into direct ground combat units was reinvigorated in the early 1990s, following Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Women deployed to the Persian Gulf in greater numbers than ever before, and the overwhelming success of American troops, men and women together, fueled the debate. The American public perceived that the nature of the battlefield may have changed since Vietnam; the last major war fought by the United States, and had become more accepting of women filling diverse roles in the military. Within a few years, barriers to women serving onboard combatant ships and in combat aircraft were removed, further expanding opportunities for women in the military.

The debate on women in combat and, more specifically, the integration of women into direct ground combat specialties—the focus of this thesis—has again burst into the spotlight, culminating with the January 2013 announcement by Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta and the CJCS, General Dempsey, rescinding the 1994 Exclusion Policy. However, the debate on integrating women into direct ground combat has steadily gained momentum since the start of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. In both wars, women distinguished themselves in combat, proving capable of serving in a variety of roles, in an environment without a clear frontline. The COIN environment in Iraq and Afghanistan has also provided women the opportunity to serve in many new, non-traditional roles, such as the Lioness Program or FETs. As ground commanders attached women to these roles to meet real-time needs, proponents of integration saw an opportunity to argue for a change in policy to better reflect the reality on the ground, further fueling the debate.

Other contributors to the increased pressure for a change included the DOD decision to repeal the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, which had prevented homosexuals

from serving openly in the military, and the decision to open 14,000 new positions to women in 2012, which brought women even closer to the frontlines. Furthermore, in 2012, two lawsuits were filed against DOD by female service members, with support from SWAN and the ACLU, citing discrimination due to barriers to women's service caused by the former exclusion policy. As momentum for change grew, leading eventually to the decision to rescind the 1994 Exclusion Policy, stakeholders on both sides presented their positions in the public media. This thesis analyzes the debate presented in online media over a two-year period beginning in 2012.

This thesis was conducted under the assumption that integration of women in direct ground combat units is inevitable, whether it occurs by the 2016 deadline or sometime after that. It is also assumed that, as good military stewards, the focus of present research should be on how to implement the change, even if one does not agree with it. Given these assumptions, this thesis investigated the question, what are the impediments and levers to gaining stakeholder acceptance for fully integrating women into ground combat arms? To address this question, the study explored the following secondary research questions:

- What is meant by “ground combat,” and has the current battlefield environment altered the definition?
- Who are the key social groups engaged in the debate?
- What are the key issues and implications of removing exclusions on women serving in direct ground combat units, as discussed in the debate?
- How does each social group frame the issue?

As described in Chapter III, the methodology used to conduct this qualitative research effort is a framing analysis. A frame analysis was determined to be suitable for this thesis because frame analyses are often used as an analytical technique to better understand phenomena that involve many social or stakeholder groups driven by different social agendas. This method fits the thesis because the debate over integrating women into direct ground combat units is a direct result of the different agendas promoted by the stakeholders involved in the debate. Each stakeholder group frames the debate differently based on its underlying assumptions and interpretations of values, which are the basis for the arguments presented by each side in the debate.

There is no easy answer to whether women should be integrated into direct ground combat units. Each individual, group, organization, and even the country as a whole, must decide what is valued—essentially, it depends on the eye of the beholder. Stakeholder groups attempt to frame problems and solutions by linking arguments to their interpretations of what they assume are widely-held American values to gain public acceptance for their position. The goal of this thesis is to better understand this debate and educate readers on its possible implications. Through analysis of the data, proponent and opponent stakeholders were identified and their arguments' frames were identified and explained. This thesis concludes with a discussion of the implications of the debate and recommendations to support gaining stakeholder acceptance of integrating women into direct ground combat positions.

## **B. CONCLUSIONS**

This analysis of the debate surrounding the integration of women into direct ground combat units identified two primary stakeholder positions, proponents and opponents of integration, and multiple stakeholder groups within each position. Six primary proponent-stakeholders are identified: SWAN; DACOWITS; ACLU's Women's Rights Project; President Obama; the Chairman and the JCS; and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. This group consists of independent organizations, government leaders, and military officers who have taken action toward removing the last barriers to women's service in the military. At the same time, three opponent-stakeholder groups are identified: CMR; a group of female service members and veterans, most notably, Captain Katie Petronio and Jude Eden; and retired military officers, including LTG Boykin, MG Brady, LTC West, and LTC Maginnis.

This analysis shows that proponents frame the debate around fairness. Proponents argue that policies creating barriers to women's service are discriminatory, preventing women from having the same opportunities as men. They argue that these barriers impose a "brass ceiling," limiting the career potential for female service members. Proponents assume the military should reflect what is valued in the society for which it serves. Thus, proponents frame the debate around fairness, arguing that exclusions violate equal

opportunity, and, in today's society, equal rights and equal opportunity are highly valued. Proponents further argue that women are already serving in combat, and rescinding the exclusion policy creates a better match between policy and reality. Thus, it is only fair that the contributions of female service members be recognized: barriers that categorize women as non-combatants prevent female service members from being treated and seen as equals to their male counterparts and, thus, from gaining the recognition they deserve.

Opponents to integration frame the debate around effectiveness, arguing that the needs of the military to support effectiveness should come above all else. Opponents argue that decades of studies highlighting the physical and physiological differences between men and women show that putting women into direct ground combat units would not only reduce military effectiveness, but disproportionately force female service members to bear undue and unfair risk. This risk is associated with greater injury rates than those of their male counterparts and the greater potential for sexual torture, if ever taken captive in combat. Opponents also argue that effectiveness would decrease, because integrating women would lead to lower standards for entry to direct ground combat units over time. Some opponents go so far as to say that the military could fight wars and win without women, but they question if the same could be done if exclusion policies are fully reversed. Opponents argue the intent of the exclusion policy is not to discriminate, but is rather a necessity—placing highest priority on the needs of effectiveness, interpreted as dependent on physical strength.

Opponents acknowledge the contributions service women have made over the past decade, but also distinguish between the combat experienced by support personnel serving in harm's way and the experiences of direct ground combatants. Opponents argue that women have contributed to recent war efforts, but not to the same degree as men. To support their argument, opponents note that women make up only two percent of those injured and killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, yet comprise over 15 percent of military personnel who have deployed to both theaters.

The fundamental differences between the extreme positions of the stakeholder groups suggest that clear agreement among these groups is unlikely. Extreme proponents will continue to push for equal rights and opportunities for women, framing their

arguments around fairness; extreme opponent-stakeholders will continue to frame their arguments around effectiveness, claiming that the needs of the military take priority over agendas pushing social change and equality. Successful implementation will require acceptance of some version of a problem and solution frame by a consensus group.

### **C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

Through the course of this study, it has become evident how broad the topic of integrating women into direct ground combat really is. This thesis analyzed the debate through online media with the intent of gaining a better understanding of the stakeholders, issues, the frames, and the assumptions and values held by each side. Opportunities exist to further increase knowledge on the implications of integrating women into direct ground combat units. For example, near-term research could explore the following questions:

- How do the current standards for entry into direct ground combat units compare with what is actually required to perform the mission of a direct ground combatant?
- What are the physical, physiological, and psychological effects that female service members have experienced due to the jobs they performed in Iraq and Afghanistan? This study is important, because, in the COIN environment, no clear frontlines exist and all service members in supporting roles (male and female alike) have been more frequently exposed to combat and the brutalities of war.
- What is the cost of integrating women into direct ground combat units? Conduct a comprehensive CBA on integrating women into direct ground combat units.

Longer-term research questions, to be explored after women have integrated into direct ground combat units, may include:

- How do future (gender-neutral) standards compare with previous (male) standards and, if changed, how have these new standards affected military performance in direct ground combat units?
- What are the effects of injury rates of females in direct ground combat units, to include non-deployable rates, and redeployment rates of women for injuries, hygiene-related issues and pregnancy, to determine the effects on the readiness and performance of direct ground combat units?
- Has integration affected unit morale and cohesion in direct ground combat units and, if so, how?

This thesis has studied the ongoing debate, as played out in online media, surrounding the integration of women into direct ground combat units. The research identifies the key stakeholder groups and the arguments presented by each side in the debate. This research shows how each side frames the debate as well as how these frames are constructed from underlying assumptions and values. In so doing, it is hoped that the readers can better understand the debate, the possible implications of change, and areas for future study as DOD moves forward with gender integration.

## APPENDIX A. TIME SUMMARY OF WOMEN IN U.S. MILITARY

This information was taken primarily from three sources: (1) Culler's 2000 thesis, (2) a timeline from the website of the Women's Research & Education Institute (WREI), and (3) Burrelli's 2013 CRS report for Congress.

Date	Event
1942	- WAAC established, followed by WAVES and WAFFS (Culler, 2000).
1943	- WAAC becomes WAC; start of Air WACs and WASP (Culler, 2000).
1947	- Army-Navy Nurse Act passed by Congress, establishes Army and Navy Nurse Corps as permanent staff corps of the Army and Navy (citing WREI). - Integrate nurses into officer ranks for first time (citing WREI).
	- Ranks capped at commander and lieutenant colonel with Nurse Corps directors authorized to hold temporary ranks of Captain and Colonel (citing WREI).
1948	- The Women's Armed Services Integration Act is passed by Congress (citing WREI).
	- Combat exclusion legislation was introduced as part of the 1948 Act by Congressman - Carl Vinson making women eligible to serve in the regular active peacetime forces under the following conditions: women cannot comprise more than 2% of the total force and no more than 10% of women can be officers; female rank is capped at the O-5 level with nurse corps directors allowed temporary rank of O-6; women are barred from serving on Navy vessels (except hospital ships and certain transports) and from flying combat aircraft in combat missions; and women are precluded from having command authority over men (citing WREI; Culler, 2000).
1951	- Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWTIS) is created (Culler, 2000). According to the DACOWTIS website, "the Committee is composed of civilian women and men who are appointed by the Secretary of Defense to provide advice and recommendations on matters and policies relating to the recruitment and retention, treatment, employment, integration, and well-being of highly qualified professional women in the Armed Forces" (DACOWTIS).
1956	- "Combat Exclusion Law is codified in Title 10, U.S. Code" (Culler, 2000, p. 16).
1967	- Public Law (P.L.) 90-130 modifies Women's Armed Service's Integration Act by removing 2% service ceiling on women and rank / grade limitation (Culler, 2000).
1969	- Air Force ROTC and the Joint Armed Forces Staff College open to women (citing WREI).

Date	Event
1972	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Congress approves an equal rights amendment (Culler, 2000).</li> <li>- All service's ROTC programs fully opened to women (Culler, 2000; WREI)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Directive Z-116 issued by Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), Admiral Zumwalt, which suspended “restrictions on women succeeding to command ashore”; women authorized limited entry into all enlisted ratings; “opens Chaplain Corps and Civil Engineering Corps to women”; and allows women to be selected for War College (citing WREI, p. 2).</li> </ul>
1973	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All-volunteer force established; expiration of the Selective Service Act ends the</li> <li>- Supreme Court rules in <i>Frontiero v. Richardson</i> that dependents of male and female (Service members should receive same benefits (Culler, 2000 and WREI).</li> <li>- “Army and Navy open flight training to women” (Culler, 2000, p. 17).</li> </ul>
1974	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DOD rescinds policy that separated pregnant women involuntarily (Culler, 2000).</li> </ul>
1975	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Service academies directed to accept women under Stratton Amendment to the Defense Authorization Bill (Culler, 2000).</li> </ul>
1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Service academies accept women into the class of 1980” (Culler, 2000, p. 17).</li> </ul>
1977	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Air Force opens aviation duty to women in non-combat aircraft and begins assigning women to the Titan Launch program (citing WREI; Culler, 2000).</li> <li>- Combat exclusion policy issued by Secretary of the Army prohibits assignment of women to combat arms (Culler, 2000).</li> <li>- Army begins co-ed basic training (Culler, 2000, p. 18).</li> </ul>
1978	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- First women assigned permanent sea duty in Navy aboard non-combat ships and up to six months of temporary duty on other ships (Culler, 2000).</li> <li>- DOD required by P.L. 95-79, Sec 303, to provide a definition of combat to Congress.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.L. 95-79, Sec. 303 states: “For the purpose of promoting equality and expanding job opportunities for the female members of the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense shall within six months from the enactment of this section, submit to the Congress a definition of the term “combat,” together with recommendations on expanding job classifications to which female members of the armed services may be assigned, and recommendations on any changes in law necessary to implement these recommendations” (p. 5)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WAC abolished by P.L. 95-485, fully integrating women into regular Army (Culler, 2000).</li> </ul>
1981	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using combat exclusion as a basis, the U.S. Supreme Court upholds the constitutionality of a male-only draft in <i>Rostker v. Goldberg</i> (citing WREI; Culler, 2000).</li> </ul>
1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Women participate in supporting roles in Grenada both on the ground and in the air (citing WREI).</li> </ul>
1988	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DOD Risk Rule is defined: “The risk rule states that noncombat units should be open to women unless the risk of exposure to direct combat, hostile fire, or</li> </ul>

Date	Event
	capture is equal to or greater than that experienced by associated combat units in the same theater of operations" (Culler citing Hooker, 1991, p. 87).
1989	- Over 770 service women participate in Operation Just Cause in Panama (citing WREI).
1990-1991	Over 40,700 women deploy to the Persian Gulf during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm; 13 women are killed and two are taken prisoner of war (citing WREI).
1991	- Congress passes legislation repealing the ban preventing women from serving aboard combat aircraft engaged in combat missions (citing WREI).
	- Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces convenes under P.L. 102-90 (Culler, 2000).
	- Incidents at Tail Hook occur, putting a spotlight on sexual harassment and the treatment of women within the military (Culler, 2000).
1992	- In its report to the President, the Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces recommends aviation and ground combat assignments remain closed to women and assignments on combat ships be opened to women (Culler, 2000).
1993	- P.L. 103-60, which prohibited women on combat vessels, is repealed by Congress (Culler, 2000).
	- In spite of recommendations listed above, then Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, orders all services to open combat aviation and all combat ships to women (citing WREI). Secretary Aspin also directs Army and Marine Corps to study opening other ground assignments to women (citing WREI). Secretary Aspin's directives resulted in over 260,000 more positions being opened to women in the U.S. military (Culler, 2000).
1994	- Risk Rule is rescinded and a new assignment rule is approved by Secretary Aspin which states, "service members are eligible to be assigned to all positions for which they are qualified, except that women shall be excluded from assignment to units below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct ground combat on the ground" (Burrelli citing DOD Memorandum: Direct Ground Combat Definition and Assignment Rule, January 13, 1994).
	- Under new assignment rule (listed above), direct ground combat is defined as "engaging the enemy on the ground with individual or crew served weapons, while being exposed to hostile fire and to a high probability of direct physical contact with the hostile force's personnel. Direct ground combat takes place well forward on the battlefield while locating and closing with the enemy to defeat them by fire, maneuver, or shock effect" (Burrelli citing DOD Memorandum: Direct Ground Combat Definition and Assignment Rule, 1994).
	It is this 1994 assignment rule that former Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, lifted in January 2013. The 1994 definition of direct ground combat is still the definition used today, however the portion of the definition that states, "Direct ground combat takes place well forward on the battlefield," is subject to much of the debate surrounding the integration of women in ground combat units

Date	Event
	because proponents of further integration argue that in the modern battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan, there is no forward area—all service members can be exposed more frequently to combat due to the nature of the battlefield environment.
1995	- USS <i>Dwight D. Eisenhower</i> is first combat vessel to sail with women (Culler, 2000).
	- Over 1200 women deploy with forces to Haiti for peacekeeping operations (citing WREI).
1996	- Peacekeeping operations in Bosnia begin, and by March 2001, over 15,000 women served in support of operations in Bosnia (citing WREI).
1998	- First women combat pilots fly operation missions to enforce the No-Fly zone in Iraq during Operation Desert Fox (citing WREI).
1999	- Women pilots and aircrew participate in combat missions flown in Kosovo. By 2001, over 8,000 service women participated in Kosovo operations in the air and on the ground (citing WREI).
2001	- Women are part of forces sent to Afghanistan starting Operation Enduring Freedom (citing WREI).
2002	- DOD required by FY03 Defense Authorization Act, to submit annual report to Congress on the status of women in the services (citing WREI).
2003	- Over 25,400 women deploy in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (citing WREI).
2009	- The Military Leadership Diversity Commission established by FY09 Defense Authorization Act. A primary duty of the commission was to “conduct a study and file a report regarding diversity issues in the Armed Forces with attention to the establishment and maintenance of fair promotion and command opportunities for ethnic and gender-specific members of the Armed Forces at the O-5 grade level and above” (Burrelli, 2013, p. 6).
2010	- Military Leadership Diversity Commission approves recommendation that, “DOD and the Services should eliminate the combat exclusion policies for women, including the removal of barriers and inconsistencies, to create a level playing field for all qualified service members (National Women’s Law Center, 2014, p. 9).
2011	- Military Leadership Diversity Commission released its report, “From Representation to Inclusion: Diversity Leadership and the 21st Century Military.” The report contains the recommendation listed above made in 2010, and included a recommendation for a time-phased approach stating: “(1) Women in a career fields/specialties currently open to them should be immediately able to be assigned to any unit that requires that career field/specialty, consistent with current operational environment; (2) DOD and the Services should take deliberate steps in a phased approach to open additional career fields and units involved in direct ground combat to qualified women; and (3) DOD and the Services should report to Congress the process and timeline for removing barriers that inhibit women from achieving senior leadership positions” (Burrelli, 2013, p. 7, citing Military Leadership

Date	Event
	Diversity Commission's 2011 Report).
2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pentagon announces opening of over 14,000 new jobs to women.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two lawsuits filed against Defense Department citing discrimination towards women based on the combat exclusion policies.</li> </ul>
2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Former Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, rescinds 1994 Exclusion Policy, lifting the ban on women serving in ground combat units (Memorandum on Elimination of 1994 Direct Ground Combat Definition and Assignment Rule, January 24, 2013).</li> </ul>
2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Female Marines begin to go through enlisted infantry training course, with 4 completing the training.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marines begin to send female officers to Infantry Officer Course on voluntary basis. As of March 2014, 14 have tried and failed.</li> </ul>

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## APPENDIX B. LIST OF DATA POINTS COLLECTED IN DATA SET

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
31-Jan-14	Military's Progress on Women in Combat Criticized	C. J. Lin	Military.com / News
30-Jan-14	One Year Later, Military Criticized over Rate of Progress for Women in Combat	C. J. Lin	<i>Stars and Stripes</i>
18-Jun-13	Services to Reveal Plans to Integrate Women in Combat	Luis Martinez	<i>ABC News</i>
25-Jul-13	The Cowardly Push to get Women into Combat	Mark Thompson	Nation.Time.com
28-Jan-14	Dempsey's Message on Women in Combat: Trust Transcends Gender	General Martin Dempsey (CJCS)	<i>Defense One</i>
25-Jun-13	Do We Need Women in Combat?	Patrick J. Buchanan	<i>The American Conservative</i>
24-Jan-13	Military Leaders Lift Ban on Women in Combat Roles	Fox News and Justin Fishel	<i>Fox News / Politics</i>
9-May-13	Women in Combat: Issues for Congress	D.F. Burrelli	PDF document
19-Jul-13	Marines Share Frank Views with Hagel on Women in Combat	Thom Shanker	<i>NYTimes</i>
3-Jun-12	Women in Combat	None Noted. Editorial	<i>NYTimes</i> / Editorial from opinion pages
29-Jan-13	Women in Combat? Some Marines React	Thomas J. Brennan	NYTimes
11-Jan-14	Two Strategies for Women in Combat	Lance M. bacon	<i>Army Times</i>
13-Feb-14	Women in Combat (2/6/2013)	Walter E. Williams	TownHall.com
18-Jun-13	Pentagon Says Women in All Combat Units by 2016	CNN Staff	CNN Politics
24-Jan-13	Valor Knows No Gender': Pentagon Lifts Ban on Women in Combat	Erin McClam	<i>NBC News</i>
1-Mar-13	The Truth about Women in Combat	David Frum	<i>The Daily Beast</i>

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
24-Jan-13	Women in Combat? Pentagon Says Yes	Jim Michaels, Tom Vanden Brook, William M. Welch	<i>USA Today</i>
7-Mar-13	Seven Myths about “Women in Combat”	LtGen (Ret) G.S. New Bold	<i>Michael Yon Online Magazine</i>
24-Jan-14	A Change Long Overdue: Rep. Tulsi Gabbard on the First Year of Women in Combat	Nora Caplan-Bricker	<i>New Republic</i>
23-Jan-13	Pentagon Removes Ban on Women in Combat	Ernesto Londoño	<i>The Washington Post</i>
16-May-13	Women in Combat: Some Lessons from Israel’s Military	Larry Abramson	<i>NPR</i>
12-Apr-13	Women in Combat: War for and Against Women	R. Cort Kirkwood	<a href="http://www.thenewamerican.com">www.thenewamerican.com</a>
21-Nov-12	Women in Combat: How should it be done?	Paul D. Shinkman	<i>US News and World Report LP</i>
3-Dec-12	Women in Combat--Its Time		<i>Los Angeles Times</i>
27-Sep-13	Marines Study Foreign Women in Combat	Gretel C. Kovach	<a href="http://UTSanDiego.com/news">UTSanDiego.com/news</a>
14-Jun-13	Panetta to Lift Ban on Women in Combat	David Martin	<i>CBS News</i>
23-Jan-13	Women in Combat: Will they have to register for the draft?	Anna Mulrine	<i>CS Monitor</i> (Christian Science Monitor)
16-Oct-13	2013 in Review: Women In Combat	Peter Saracino	Encyclopedia Britannica Blog
14-Aug-13	Spinning the Story on Women in Land Combat	Center for Military Readiness (CMR)	<i>CMR website</i>
27-Aug-13	CMR Submits Statement for Record of House Hearing for Women in Land Combat	Center for Military Readiness (CMR)	<i>CMR website</i>
14-Nov-13	Double-Think and Dissembling About Double Standards in Combat	Center for Military Readiness (CMR)	<i>CMR website</i>
30-Jul-13	Stealth Attack on Draft-Age Women	Center for Military Readiness (CMR)	<i>CMR website</i>
21-Apr-13	Seven Reasons Why Women-in-Combat Diversity Will Degrade Tough Training Standards	Center for Military Readiness (CMR)	<i>CMR website</i>
10-Jul-12	Get Over It! We Are Not All Created Equal	Capt Katie Petronio	<i>Marine Corps Gazette</i>
19-Jun-13	Pentagon Details Plans for Women in Combat Roles	Kate Brannen and Stephanie Gaskell	

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
24-Jan-14	Female Soldiers Begin Serving in Combat Units in April	Cathy Burke	<i>Newsmax</i>
21-Feb-13	Women in Combat: The Soldiers Speak	Elise Cooper	<i>American Thinker</i>
27-Mar-13	Women In Combat	SWAN	<i>SWAN Service Women's Action Network</i>
24-Jul-13	U.S. Military Vows to Put Women in Combat Roles by 2016	David Lerman	<i>Bloomberg</i>
24-Jan-13	Combat Ban for Women to End	Julian E. Barnes, Dion Nissenbaum	<i>The Wall Street Journal</i>
21-Jan-13	DONNELLY: Measuring Risk for Women in Combat	Elaine Donnelly	<i>The Washington Times</i>
25-Jan-13	8 Other Nations that Send Women to Combat	Anna Mulrine	<i>National Geographic</i>
25-Jan-13	Americans Favor Allowing Women into Combat	Alyssa Brown	<i>GALLUP</i>
25-Jan-13	Women in Combat: U.S. Military Officially lifts ban on female soldiers	Paul Harris	<i>The Guardian</i>
23-Jan-13	Female Veterans Have Mixed Reaction to Lifting of Combat Restrictions	Ellen J. Hearst	<i>Chicago tribune</i>
24-Jan-13	Pentagon Lifts ban on Women in Combat	Phil Stewart, David Alexander	<i>Reuters</i>
30-Jan-13	SMA explains way ahead for women in combat	David Vergun	<a href="http://www.army.mil">www.army.mil</a>
24-Jan-13	Defense department Expands Women's Combat Role	Claudette Roulo	<a href="http://Defense.gov">Defense.gov</a>
28-Jan-13	The FAQs: Women in Combat	Joe Carter	<i>The Gospel Coalition Blog</i>
27-Dec-13	Women in Combat	Ian Welsh	<a href="http://ianwelsh.net">ianwelsh.net / blog</a>
29-Jul-13	Deadly Consequences: How Cowards are Pushing Women into Combat	Robert L. Maginnis	<i>Amazon</i> (link to book deadly Consequences)
26-Apr-12	Women in the U.S. Military: Growing Share, Distinctive Profile	Eileen Patten, Kim parker	<i>Pew Research Center</i>
24-Nov-13	After first co-ed infantry class, new perspectives on women in combat	Hope H. Seck	<i>Marine Times</i>
3-Feb-13	Women in Combat: Lifting the ban for better or worse?	Kylie Schultz	<i>The International</i>

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
25-Jan-03	The Feminist Object to Women in Combat	Noah Berlatsky	<i>The Atlantic</i>
22-Feb-13	Feminist: Women in Combat can use Birth Control to Eliminate Their Periods	Penny Starr	<i>CNS news</i>
23-Jan-13	Pentagon Reportedly Will Lift Ban on Women in Combat	Josh Voorhees	<i>Slate</i>
15-May-03	After Challenging Military Ban on Women in Combat, Molly Pitcher Project's Dreams are Realized	Brian McNeill	<i>UVA School of Law</i>
23-Jan-13	Secretary of Defense Lifts Ban on Women in Combat	Aviva Shen, Hayes brown	<i>Think Progress</i>
1-Feb-03	Marine Survey list concerns on women in combat	Julie Watson	<i>Yahoo News</i>
29-Jan-13	Broad Support for Combat Roles for Women	Pew Research Center	<i>The Washington Post</i>
23-Jan-13	AP Sources: Pentagon Open Combat Roles to Women	Lolita C. Baldor	<i>Associated Press</i>
17-Jan-14	Military Women in Combat	Nancy Carol	<i>Squidoo</i>
23-Jan-13	Women in Combat and the Undoing of Civilization	Denny Burk	<a href="http://www.dennyburk.com">www.dennyburk.com</a>
15-May-03	Natural Born Killers	Nathaniel Penn	<i>GQ.com</i>
24-Jan-13	U.S. Military Lifts ban on Women in Combat	Sarah Pruitt	<i>History in the Headlines</i>
26-Jan-13	The Problems of Women in Combat - From a Female Combat Vet	Jude Eden	<i>The Western Center for Journalism</i>
24-Jan-13	Marco Rubio Backs Women in Combat	John Stanton	<i>Buzzfeed / Politics</i>
21-Feb-13	Women in Combat	Stephanie Kraus	<i>TIME for Kids</i>
23-Jan-13	Will Allowing Women in Combat Roles Revolutionize Military Leadership?	Jenna Goudreau	<i>Forbes</i>
26-Jan-13	Women in Combat: Now It's Official, But They Were Already Fighting	Jacey Fortin	<a href="http://www.ibTimes.com">www.ibTimes.com</a>
24-Jan-13	Obama Ignores Deadly Risk to Women in Combat	Arnold Ahlert	<i>FrontPage Magazine</i>
25-Jan-13	Women in Combat	Walter Williams	<a href="http://Creators.com">Creators.com</a>

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
27-Jul-13	New Book Examines Role of Women in Combat	Thomas Gibbons-Neff	<i>Washington Free beacon</i>
31-Jan-14	Restrictions on Assignments of Military Women: A Brief History		<i>National Women's Law Center</i>
25-Jan-13	Why Ending the Ban on Women in Combat is Good for All Women	Jessica Valenti	<i>The Nation</i>
30-Jan-13	Women in Combat: Another Nail in the Coffin	Jared Taylor	<i>Taki's Magazine</i>
23-Jan-13	Panetta to Lift ban on Women in Combat	Jeremy Herb	<i>The Hill</i>
16-Jan-14	Are Women in the U.S. Military Ready for the Frontline of War?	Crystal Sheppard	<i>Care2 Causes</i>
2-Jan-14	Women of the Israel Defense Force: History in Combat Units	Elie Berman	<i>Jewish Virtual Library</i>
18-Feb-13	Most Decorated Living Vet Blasts 'Women in Combat'	unknown	<i>WND</i>
18-Feb-13	Women in Foxholes	Maj Gen (Ret) Patrick Brady	<i>WND</i>
26-Jan-13	Women in Combat Spells Trouble	Linda Chavez	<i>New York Post</i>
24-Jan-13	4 ways Women in Combat will Change Business	Bill Murphy Jr	Inc.com
10-Feb-12	Santorum: Women in Combat Could Compromise Missions	Scott Stump	<i>Today news</i>
24-Jan-13	Women in Combat? Ok, but what about sexual assault?	Chloe Angyal	<i>MSNBC</i>
24-Jan-13	Women in Combat: the new Conservative case Against female Autonomy	Cord Jefferson	<a href="http://www.gawker.com">www.gawker.com</a>
24-Jan-13	Allen West Slams Women in Combat 'Social Experiment,' Suggest They Should also Join NHL and NBA	Matt Wilstein	<i>Mediaite</i>
12-Feb-03	Women in Combat	Eddie Arruza	<i>Chicago Tonight</i>
5-Feb-13	Women in Combat is Civilizing?	Jeffrey H. Anderson	<i>The Weekly Standard</i>
7-Mar-13	The Inconvenient Truth About Women and Combat	Jack Murphy	<i>SOFREP</i>
5-Jan-14	Gender Equality? A double standard for women in the military	Amber Barno	<i>The Daily caller</i>

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
18-Jun-13	5 Ways Women in Combat will Change Everything	Emily Deruy, Adam Weinstein	Fushion.net
21-Feb-13	Women in Combat: 'A marine is a Marine'	Paul Rodriguez	<i>The Orange County Register</i>
23-Jan-03	Given Deborah, Jael, and Judith, Why Shouldn't Women Serve in Combat?	Owen Strachan, Jan McCormack, Alan Baker	<i>Christianity Today</i>
31-Jan-13	Rethinking Women in Combat	Kim Tran	<i>The Feminist Wire</i>
Feb 1, 20132	Women in Combat...and Selective Service?	Transcript: Rush Limbaugh and caller	<i>The Rush Limbaugh Show</i>
4-Feb-13	There's A Big Unknown About Putting the Female Body in Combat	Paul Szoldra	<i>Business Insider</i>
23-Jan-13	Democrats Support Panetta Plan to Lift Ban on Women in Combat	Frank Oliveri	<i>Roll Call</i>
28-Jan-13	Ban on Women in Combat Lifted: is the Military Ready?	Lisa A. Mazzie	<i>Marquette University Law School Faculty Blog</i>
30-Jan-13	Women in Combat: A Distraction from the Real issue	John Grant	<a href="http://www.thiscantbehappening.net">www.thiscantbehappening.net</a>
4-Feb-13	Women in Combat: "Why not?"	Jack Donovan	<i>Counter-Currents Publishing</i>
7-Feb-13	Women in Combat	Jennifer M. Walters	<i>Scholastic News Online</i>
24-Jan-13	Here's How the Military Will Finally Accept (Most) Women in Combat	Spencer Ackerman	<a href="http://Wired.com">Wired.com</a>
30-Jan-13	Ban Lifted, Rape Culture Still Plagues Women in Combat	Maayan Schechter	<a href="http://Thebluebanner.net">Thebluebanner.net</a>
31-Jan-13	Women in Combat and the Constitutionality of Male-Only Draft Registration	Ilya Somin	<i>The Volokh Conspiracy</i>
24-Jan-13	Women in Combat: A Trailblazing Woman Vet Speaks Out	Annie Groer	<i>MORE Magazine</i>
23-Jan-13	Pentagon Chief Leon Panetta Lifting Ban on Women Serving in Combat	Joseph Straw, Bill Hutchinson	<i>NY Daily News</i>
25-Jan-13	Women in Combat: See Jane Shoot	W. W. Houston	<i>The Economist</i>
28-Feb-12	A History of Women in the U.S. Military	Jennie Wood	<a href="http://Infoplease.com">Infoplease.com</a>

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
24-Jan-13	Women in Combat: A By-the-Numbers Look	Leada Gore	al.com / blog
21-Apr-12	The Problem with Women in Combat Units	Soren Sjogren	Sorensjogren.com
9-May-12	How do you feel about women in combat?	Not provided	SpouseBUZZ.com
23-Jan-03	The ban on Women in Combat Will officially end	Elspeth Reeve	<i>The Wire</i>
23-Jan-13	Lioness (Film)	Meg McLagan, Daria Sommers	www.lionessthefilm.com
30-Jan-13	Women in Combat?	Robert R. Reilly	<i>The Catholic Exchange</i>
22-Jun-03	provides numerous articles or excerpts from articles on women in combat	None Noted	<i>The Baltimore Sun</i>
25-Jan-13	The Problem(s) of Women in Combat (repeat from another source)	June Eden	<i>Political Animal</i>
29-Jan-13	Careerists v. Mother Nature	June Eden	<i>Political Animal</i>
4-Feb-13	Women in Combat Units Vs. The Military's Sexual Assault Problem	June Eden	<i>Political Animal</i>
12-Feb-13	Let the Men Be Heroes - Because they Are	June Eden	<i>Political Animal</i>
17-Jan-14	Women Fail to Achieve Male Marine's Lowest Standards	June Eden	<i>Political Animal</i>
28-Jan-13	Against Women in Combat	Gene Veith	<i>Cranach: the Blog of Veith</i>
10-Apr-13	Women in Combat (a collection of articles and blog post)	Herschel Smith	<i>The Captain's Journal</i>
9-Jan-14	Are Women Fit for Combat Roles in the Military?	Anthony Chibarirwe	theTRUMPET.com
28-Jan-13	Why Women in Combat is a Mistake	Joe Repay	<i>Star Tribune</i>
8-Feb-13	What Lifting the Ban on Women in Combat Really means for the Future of the Military	Meredith Turits	<i>Glamour</i>
5-Jul-12	Don't Put Women in Combat, says female Combat Veteran	Katie J. M. Baker	jezebel.com
28-Jan-13	Women in Ground Combat	Bing West	<i>the American interest</i>

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
5-Jan-13	Should Women in the Armed Forces be Allowed in Combat?	Non noted, just screen names	DEBATE.org
24-Mar-13	Women in Combat: The ‘Angel of Death’	Dorian De Wind	<i>The Moderate Voice</i>
3-Dec-13	How to lead Infantrywomen in Combat	Don Gomez	<i>Carrying the Gun</i>
25-Jan-13	State tests women in combat role	Dennis Yusko	<i>Times Union</i>
22-Mar-13	Commander: Women ‘in Combat every day’	Kyle Roerink	<i>The Billings Gazette</i>
30-Jan-13	Women in Combat: It’s Their Choice	None noted, opinion piece	phillyburbs.com
1-Apr-13	“Women in Combat”: myths and realities	Chris Hernandez	chrishernandezauthor.com
28-Feb-13	Women in Combat: History and Future	Kathy Johnson	<i>The Military Law Task Force</i>
23-Jan-13	Military to Allow Women into Combat Jobs	Will Hobson, John Martin	<i>Tampa Bay Times</i>
6-Jan-14	The Folly of Men Arming Women for Combat	John Piper	<i>Desiring God</i>
5-Dec-13	Military Women in Combat: What do Voters Think?		<i>Rasmussen Reports</i>
26-Jan-13	How the Rules Changed on Women in Combat - A Legislative and Executive History Primer	Susan Hennessey	<i>Lawfare</i>
11-Jan-14	2 Strategies for Women in Combat	Lance M. Bacon	<i>Army Times</i>
27-Jan-13	Women in Combat: Colonel Martha McSally versus Lt. Gen. Jerry Boykin	Transcribed video conversation	<i>The Right Scoop</i>
25-Jan-13	Women in Combat: Why did Obama Avoid Congress?	Joel B. Pollak	www.breitbart.com
25-Feb-13	Women in Combat Could Blunt ‘Tip of the Spear’	Lee Webb, Tracy Winborn	<i>CBN News</i>
31-Jan-13	Women in Combat: Does This go Against God’s Divine Order?	Diana Bridgett	<i>The Christian Post</i>
20-Dec-12	Women and warfare: Denying Combat Recognition Creates ‘Brass Ceiling’	Katie Miller, Lindsay Rosenthal	<i>Center for American Progress</i>
2-Feb-03	Women in Combat: Behind the Pentagon’s Decision	Kathy Durkin	<i>Worker World</i>

Date	Title	Author	Data Source
30-Jan-13	Women in Combat: What it means for the Military	Truman Project Staff	<i>The Truman National Security Project</i>
25-Jan-13	Resolved: Women in Combat Results in a Suboptimal Military	Matt Briggs	<a href="http://www.briggs.com/blog">www.briggs.com/blog</a>
16-Feb-13	Women in Combat Victor Unclear as Roles Debated	K. Burnell Evans	<i>The Daily Progress</i>
5-Jul-12	Servicewomen's group critical of anti-'women in combat' editorial	David Ferguson	<i>The Raw Story</i>
12-Feb-13	Women in Combat: Female Former Army Captain Speaks Out	David Badash	<i>The New Civil Rights Movement</i>
17-Nov-13	Women in combat zone alongside men: wrong on so many levels	Michele Hickford	<a href="http://allenbwest.com">allenbwest.com</a>
24-Jan-13	Florida National Guard Chief Endorses Women in Combat	Carol Rosenberg	<i>The Miami Herald</i>
11-Feb-12	In Context: Santorum on Women in Combat	Bill Adair	<i>Tampa Bay Time / PolitiFact</i>
29-Jan-13	Sexism, war, and women in combat: What does lifting the sexist ban on combat arms jobs really mean?	None noted.	<a href="http://www.defendwomensrights.org">www.defendwomensrights.org</a>
28-Jan-13	On Women in Combat (Roles)	David Silbey	<a href="http://Chronicle.com">Chronicle.com</a>
4-Feb-13	Women in Combat and the Priesthood: A Response to Mary Hunt	Marian Ronan	<a href="http://www.religiousdispatches.org">www.religiousdispatches.org</a>
30-Jan-13	Women In Combat: Ready, Willing, and Able?	Laura Johnston	<i>Harvard National Security Journal</i>
9-Feb-12	Sources: Pentagon rules shift on women in combat	Lolita C. Baldor	<a href="http://SaukValley.com">SaukValley.com</a>
24-Oct-13	A Voice for Men	None named	<a href="http://www.avoiceformen.com">www.avoiceformen.com</a>
9-Jan-14	Lady Cadets of Pakistan	Aeyliya Husain	<i>VICE United Kingdom</i>
28-Aug-12	Aboriginal Programs	None noted	<i>FORCES.CA</i>

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## LIST OF REFERENCES

American Civil Liberties Union. (n.d.). About the ACLU. Retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/about-aclu-0/>.

Baldor, L. C. (2012, February 9). Sources: Pentagon rules shift on women in combat. Retrieved from <http://saukvalley.com/20120209/sources-pentagon-rules-shift-on-women-in-combat/>.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611–639.

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The craft of research* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Brady, P. H. (2013, February 18). Women in foxholes. Retrieved from <http://www wnd com/2013/02/women-in-foxholes/>.

Brown, K. (2007). *Co-ed combat: The new evidence that women shouldn't fight the nation's wars*. New York: Penguin Group (USA), Inc.

Burrelli, David F. (2013). *Women in Combat: Issues for Congress*. (CRS Report No. R42075). Washington DC: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://www fas org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42075 pdf>.

Carreiras, H., & Kümmel, G. (2008). Women in the military and in armed conflict (1st ed.). Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verl. für Sozialwiss.

Cawkill, P., Rogers, A., Knight, S., & Spear, L. (2009). Women in ground close combat roles: The experiences of other nations and a review of the academic literature. (DSTL/CR37770 V3-0): Defense Science and Technology Laboratory. Ministry of Defense. Ports Down, Wilshire, U.K.

Center for Military Readiness. CMR Mission Statement. Retrieved from <http://www cmrlink org/content/MissionStatement/>.

Clemmitt, M. (2009). Women in the military: Should combat roles be fully opened to women? *CQ Researcher*, 19(40), 957–980.

Creed, W., Langstraat, J., & Scully, M. (2002). A picture of the frame: Frame analysis as technique and as politics. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5(1), 34–55.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Culler, K. W. (2000). *The decision to allow military women into combat positions: A study in policy and politics*. Master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School.

Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services. (2012). Quarterly meeting minutes, Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services, Alexandria, VA.

Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services. (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://dacomits.defense.gov/>.

Department of Defense. DOD mission. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/about/#mission/>.

DOD memos on women in combat roles. Statement on women in service. (2013, January 24). *InsideDefense*. Retrieved from <http://insidedefense.com/201301242422472/Defense-Plus/Text-Document/dod-memos-on-women-in-combat-roles/menu-id-77.html>.

Donnelly, E. (2013, January 21). Measuring risks for women in combat. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jan/21/measuring-risk-for-women-in-combat/>.

Dunivin, K. O. (1994). Military culture: Change and continuity. *Armed Forces & Society*, 20(4), 531–547.

Eden, J. (2013, January 25). The problem(s) of women in combat. Retrieved from <http://politicalanimalblog.com/2013/01/25/the-problem-of-women-in-combat/>.

Eden, J. (2013, January 29). Careerists v. Mother Nature. Retrieved from <http://politicalanimalblog.com/2013/01/29/the-problems-of-women-in-combat-part-2/>.

Eden, J. (2014, January 17). Women fail to achieve male marines' lowest standard. Retrieved from <http://politicalanimalblog.com/2014/01/17/women-fail-to-achieve-male-marines-lowest-standard/>.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study analysis. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.

Female soldiers train for special role in Afghanistan. (2011, November 16). Retrieved from <http://newsforyouonline.com/stories.asp?ID=832>.

Ferguson, D. (2012, July 5). Servicewomen's group critic of anti-'women in combat' editorial. Retrieved from <http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2012/07/05/servicewomens-group-critical-of-anti-women-in-combat-editorial/>.

Goldman, N. (1973). The changing role of women in the armed forces. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(4), 892–911.

Goudreau, J. (2013, January 23). Will allowing women in combat roles revolutionize military leadership? Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jennagoudreau/2013/01/23/will-allowing-women-in-combat-roles-revolutionize-military-leadership/>.

Halloran, R. (1987, October 1). Women in combat focus of hearings. *New York Times*, pp. A.15.

Harrell, M. & Miller, L. (1997). New opportunities for military women: Effects upon readiness, cohesion, and morale. Santa Monica, CA: RAND's National Defense Research Institute.

Hatch, M. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 657–693.

*Hearing on Women in Service Review: Hearing before the House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Personnel, House of Representatives*, 113th Cong., 7 (2013) (testimony of Elaine Donnelly).

Henderson, A. (2013, April 25). Ban lifted, but few women apply for combat roles. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-04-25/ban-lifted-but-few-women-apply-for-combat-roles/4650772>.

Hennessey, S. (2013, January 26). How the rules changed on women in combat - A legislative and executive history primer. Retrieved from <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/01/how-the-rules-changed-on-women-in-combat-a-legislative-and-executive-history-primer/>.

Houston, W. W. (2013, January 25). See Jane shoot. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/node/21570967/>.

Hubermann, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Joint Chiefs of Staff. (n.d.). About the JCS. Retrieved May 14, 2014, from <http://www.jcs.mil/About.aspx>.

Major General Patrick H. Brady. (n.d.). Biographical info. Retrieved May 14, 2014, from <http://generalbrady.com/>.

Maginnis, R. L. (2013). *Deadly consequences: How cowards are pushing women into combat*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc.

Maginnis, R. L. (n.d.). Biography from Ambassador. Retrieved May 14, 2014, from <http://www.ambassadorspeakers.com/ACP/speakers.aspx?speaker=657>

McClam, E. (2013, January 24). ‘Valor knows no gender’: Pentagon lifts ban on women in combat. *NBC News*. Retrieved from [http://usnews.nbcnews.com/\\_news/2013/01/24/16681072-valor-knows-no-gender-pentagon-lifts-ban-on-women-in-combat?lite/](http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/01/24/16681072-valor-knows-no-gender-pentagon-lifts-ban-on-women-in-combat?lite/).

Menke, T. T. (2013). *The integration of women into combat arms units*. Quantico, VA: Command and Staff College, Marine Corps University.

Miles, M. B., & Hubermann, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, K. & Rosenthal, L. (2012, December 20). Women and warfare: denying combat recognition creates ‘brass ceiling.’ Retrieved from <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/military/news/2012/12/20/48619/women-and-warfare-denying-combat-recognition-creates-brass-ceiling/>.

Miller, L. L., Kavanagh, J., Lytell, M. C., Jennings, K., & Martin, C. (2012). The extent of restrictions on the service of active-component military women. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Petronio, K. (2012, July 10). Get over it! We are not all created equal. *The Marine Corps Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/article/get-over-it-we-are-not-all-created-equal/>.

Piper, J. (2014, January 6). The folly of men arming women for combat. *Desiring God*. Retrieved from <http://www.desiringgod.org/blog/posts/the-folly-of-men-arming-women-for-combat/>.

President of CMR. (n.d.). Retrieved May, 15, 2014, from <http://www.cmrlink.org/content/about-elaine-donnelly/>.

Putko, M. M., & Johnson, D. V. (2008). *Women in combat compendium*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Randazzo-Matsel, A., Schulte, J., & Yopp, J. (2012). Assessing the implications of possible changes to women in service restrictions: Practices of foreign militaries and other organizations. Alexandria, VA: Center for Naval Analyses.

Rubino, S. (1995). When gender goes to combat: The role of “representations” in the assignment of women in the military. Doctoral dissertation, The American University.

Service Women’s Action Network. (n.d.). Mission statement. Retrieved May 13, 2014, from <http://servicewomen.org/about/mission/>.

Sheppard, C. (2007). *Women in combat*. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks PA.

Tyson, A. S. (2005, May 26). Bid to limit women in combat withdrawn. *The Washington Post*, pp. A.01.

U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness. (2011). Report: Population Representation in the Military Services. Retrieved from <http://prhome.defense.gov/RFM/MPP/AP/POPREP.aspx>

U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense. (2013, January 24). *Memorandum: Direct ground combat definition and assignment rule*. Washington, DC: Author.

Webb, L. & Winborn, T. (2013, February 25). Women in combat could blunt 'tip of the spear'. *CBN News*. <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/us/2013/February/Women-in-Combat-Could-Blunt-Tip-of-the-Spear/>.

Williams, W. (2013, January 25). Women in combat. Retrieved from <http://www.creators.com/opinion/walter-williams/women-in-combat/html>.

Wilstein, M. (2013, January 24). Allen West slams women in combat 'social experiment,' suggests they should also join NHL and NBA. Retrieved from <http://www.mediate.com/tv/allen-west-slams-women-in-combat-'social-experiment'-suggets-they-join-nhl-and-nba/>.

Women in combat. (2013, March 27). Retrieved from <http://servicewomen.org/women-in-combat/>.

Women in combat: Colonel Martha McSally versus Lieutenant General Jerry Boykin. (2013, January 27). Retrieved from <http://therightscoop.com/women-in-combat-colonel-martha-mcsally-versus-lt-gen-jerry-boykin/>.

Women's Research and Education Institute. (n.d.). *Chronology of Significant Legal & Policy Changes Affecting Women in the Military: 1947–2003*. Arlington, VA: Women's Research and Education Institute. Retrieved March 10, 2014, from <http://www.wrei.org/>.

World Net Daily Exclusive. (2013, February 18). Most decorated living vet blasts women in combat. Retrieved from <http://www wnd com/2013/02/most-decorated-living-vet-blasts-women-in-combat/>.

Young, L. M., & Nauta, M. M. (2013). Sexism as a predictor of attitudes toward women in the military and in combat. *Military Psychology*, 25(2), 166–171.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST**

1. Dudley Knox Library  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California
2. Naval Postgraduate School  
Academic Associate, Defense Systems Analysis  
Monterey, California